

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 269. Resolution in opposition to any visit to United States by Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend sections 501 through 504 of the 1958 Amendments to the Social Security Act (Public Law 85-840) to permit the Territory of Hawaii to again obtain the full benefits of the Social Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 7296. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7297. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Drucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 7298. A bill for the relief of Montgomery Hyun (Man Kyu Hyun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7299. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Abitbol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7300. A bill for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7301. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas Hwa Young Chun and Dr. Lucia Soondong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7302. A bill for the relief of Ming Sang Quon (Quon Ming Sang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 7303. A bill for the relief of Compton Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7304. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joaquim da Silva Aresta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7305. A bill for the relief of Teresina Ricca and Giuseppina Costanza Costantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7306. A bill for the relief of Corradino Francesco Vilardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 7307. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Potts, Mildred Potts, and Eileen Potts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education & Welfare Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 7309. A bill for the relief of Antonina Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 7310. A bill for the relief of Pedro Bigornia Bandayrel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 7311. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7312. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ebrahim Mojdehi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

192. Mr. WESTLAND presented a petition of the president and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fern-dale, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to voicing approval and disapproval of proposed legislation relating to alcoholic beverages, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Needed: An Investment Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we in the West know the true worth of the investment made to develop our natural resources, the return which this investment has brought, and the need for a continuation of this attitude and program now.

That is why the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] struck such a responsive chord when he addressed the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Tacoma, Wash., May 2, 1959.

So that my colleagues may know Senator SYMINGTON's appraisal of problems besetting us today, I ask unanimous consent to have his Tacoma address set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, DEMOCRAT OF MISSOURI, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER, TACOMA, WASH., MAY 2, 1959

Thank you very much for asking me to be with you here in Tacoma.

It is a privilege to visit your busy and beautiful State, and to meet with so many people who have a hand in developing the rich resources of the Pacific Northwest.

Here in the State of Washington you not only have a rich store of wealth in your

mountains, fields, rivers and valleys, but are very fortunate in your geographical position.

The location of the Seattle-Tacoma area on the great circle route between two hemispheres makes it a great gateway for the jet age.

With the forward-looking leadership characteristic of this area, there is no limit to what can be achieved in this wonderful country.

By your choice of Governor and Senators, you have insured yourselves the kind of leadership we need, not only in Washington and the Northwest, but in all America.

I want to pay tribute to your outstanding Governor, Albert Rosellini.

In these days of tightened sources of State income it is not easy to build the kind of record Al Rosellini has made; and this is especially true when you inherit a deficit from the previous administration.

But your Governor has had the vision to write a progressive program, the good sense to face the financial realities, and the courage to put the State on a pay-as-you-go basis.

When the Governor of New York put over his tax program, the newspapers started running him for President. They should look as well to the State of Washington.

May I also pay tribute to your senior Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON. He is the able and experienced chairman of a great committee, and one of the most respected elder statesmen of the Senate.

All of us benefit from his experience, wisdom, and advice.

You always know where MAGGY stands. Invariably it is on the side of progress; i.e., the side of the people.

As for your junior Senator, "SCOOP" JACKSON, I don't have to tell you what I think about him.

SCOOP and I have long been partners in the effort to keep this country strong so it can remain free.

There is no more reliable friend and ally; and I predict that SCOOP will have a great future as a leader of America.

It is a long way from the State of Washington to the city of Washington. But I can report, as a somewhat prejudiced observer, that the Republican Party in the Nation's Capitol is just as bad off there as it is here.

Before the last election, an official at the White House wrote a book, "A Republican Looks at His Party."

Now he is writing a sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

As they look at the calendar, the Republicans become more and more worried.

Next year, they see, is a presidential election year. If they are going to win again, they know they are going to have to pull a very large rabbit out of the hat.

Let me tell you a story I understand actually happened. As you know, the Republicans have now appointed a nationwide committee to try to formulate the true principles of their party.

This committee held a meeting recently; and one member, a sort of newcomer to Republican politics, said he thought what the party needed, more than anything else, was to stop acting like the party of privilege, and start representing the interests of all the people.

But older and more experienced Republican heads intervened.

One of them said in all seriousness, "You are wrong. We are the party of privilege. This has been our role throughout our history, and we should not change."

There is nothing like honest confession—and this confession of philosophy helps explain the Republican policies of today.

A party of privilege is bound to tradition. It looks backward.

It is opposed to growth and investment. It perpetuates waste.

It approaches the most pressing problems of the country with timidity, washing them gently with solutions which are 10 years old.

This preoccupation with tradition results in strange inconsistencies in national policy.

As example, the administration is obsessed by the threat of inflation, even though, according to the consumer price index, the last 12 months witnessed no inflation whatsoever.

Yet efforts to eliminate unemployment are ignored, even though that current problem is so pressing.

In your own State it now constitutes 8 percent of the labor force. In some States as high as 15 percent.

The administration justifies its reductions in the budget by asserting it wants to save our children from the burden of interest payments on the national debt.

But what do these reductions actually cut?

They cut funds for better schools, which in the long run would give our greatest resource—these very children—an opportunity to add thousands of dollars to their incomes.

They cut funds for medical research, which would add many useful years to the lives of all citizens.

Because the Republicans have been so preoccupied with tradition and are afraid of modernization, they have failed in their pledge to keep waste out of Government.

From the 99 chauffeur-driven Cadillacs, to the jungle of committees in the Pentagon, to the six different air forces the taxpayer now supports, to the great and growing mess in the Department of Agriculture, there is now mountainous waste in our Government.

We pay for that waste in taxes. We pay for it doubly, since all these billions of wasted money could be used for what we really need.

My friends, this preoccupation with looking backward, which lends so much to this duplication and waste, is nevertheless not the most serious flaw of this Republican administration.

The people are on to much of this, as the last election showed.

By far the most serious Republican policy—and it is slowly coming to light—is the way this administration has concealed from the people the steady deterioration of our position in the world.

This latter policy is very serious, because it goes to the heart of our democratic system—the people's right to know the facts, and thereupon to act upon them.

If they are lulled into complacency, how can they make the effort necessary to keep us both prosperous and free.

The people want the truth—and because of these misrepresentations, come next year, will turn these Republicans out.

In 1960, at local, State, and National levels, the people will give the Democratic Party the greatest victory in its history.

May I talk briefly tonight about two areas in which we have been misled: national security and economic growth.

First, as to our defenses:

The administration has been telling us that we had defenses we do not have.

As illustration: For a long time the administration withheld the facts about Russian development of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The American people were led to believe we were in fine shape, maybe even ahead, in both the development and the production schedule of this weapon.

But last January the Secretary of Defense finally admitted that the Russians will soon have a 3-to-1 lead over us in this field.

What happened when we learned the truth about ICBM's?

The people were immediately informed that our weakness there was compensated by strength in other sectors. One of those

listed was our intermediate range ballistic missiles, which, we were told, were operational on foreign bases.

But now we learn that none of these IRBM's are operational—and are told the Russians have many hundreds of medium range ballistic missiles that are operational.

And what was the other major part of our defense balance that justified our voluntarily handing over ICBM superiority to the Communists?

It is the Strategic Air Command, which the administration says comprises over 90 percent of our retaliatory capacity.

Under questioning, however, the administration admits that three-fourths of the present Strategic Air Force is obsolescent; and that its 3-year plan for replacement of these old bombers will replace only a very small percent of those now in operation.

In his television address to the Nation a month ago, the President showed a chart of 17 missiles he said were "now in use by our Armed Forces."

Only one of these missiles could travel farther than from San Francisco to Los Angeles. That one was not operational then, and isn't now.

This entire process reminds me of the used car salesman who wants his customer to look only at the new paint job, because if he examines the car more closely, he will discover it has no clutch, no brakes, and no motor.

Now, about our economy.

The challenge we face from the Sino-Soviet Empire is fully as much economic as it is military.

The Communists are out to outproduce us, dry up our markets, and show the world that they can offer material welfare equal to, and superior to, that of the United States.

They are still behind us in some areas—but they are gaining fast.

Since 1950, the Russians have gone from 34 percent of American steel production to 71 percent; from 46 percent of our coal production to 113 percent; and from 27 percent of our aluminum production to 39 percent.

But does this administration warn the American people of this Russian progress, or take the steps to meet it?

It does not.

In the last Democratic administration, our economy grew at the rate of about 5 percent per year.

In this administration, economic growth has been slowed to a little over 1 percent a year.

Is this the way to provide for a population which will reach 235 million by 1975?

Is this the way to provide for the growth of the West?

Or is it the way to stunt the growth of the West?

If we had been able to keep up the Democratic growth rate between 1953 and 1958, it would have meant: \$2,800 more income for each family; \$31 billion more for our farmers; 10 million more man-years of employment; and \$39 billion more private investment.

Every segment of our economy, every section of our Nation, would have been more prosperous than it is today.

At least as much as most, you in the Pacific Northwest have tasted the bitter fruits of Republican economic contraction.

You have seen the resources wasted by the policy of no new starts on the Columbia River.

You have felt the credit pinch of tight money.

You have felt the drain of unemployment.

You have seen glowing opportunities for the development of this region snuffed out by the indifference of this administration.

What you need is more investment capital to develop the riches that lie at your feet.

This requires a willingness on the part of our Government to make long-term investments instead of continuing to be obsessed with budget balancing on a year-to-year basis.

It requires an administration which is not afraid of growth.

I believe there must be more willingness on the part of Government to conceive and carry out broad economic plans, instead of responding haphazardly and uneconomically to such crises as power shortages and floods.

As we all know, the difference between civilized man and the savage is planning. The difference between men and animals is that men look ahead.

Long-range planning of resource development therefore, on a multistate basis, would enable the West to know where it was going, and how fast.

So, my fellow Democrats, our work between now and the next election would seem cut out for us.

We must set the record straight.

We must tell the people the truth about the world situation—and also about the lost opportunities caused by the policies of these Republicans.

We must convince them, by our record in Congress and in the country, that the Democrats will improve that record.

If we do so we will win; and the Nation will be stronger for the effort we have made and will make in the years to come.

University of Connecticut and Georgetown University Scientific Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this week's discussion of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I should like to call attention to a healthy development in the field of education. This is the move on the part of our academic world to concentrate the spotlight of research on some of the difficult problems that are unfolding in the space sciences.

Two noted universities, one a State university and the other privately endowed, have recently announced studies which underline the reinforced interest in science. One is intended to bring latest information on technology together; the other is to examine the more theoretical aspects of space law.

The University of Connecticut has concluded plans for its second annual institute on missile technology. It is sponsored by the Chief of Research and Development, U.S. Army. The course will run from July 26 through August 7, and will cover all important principles connected with the application of missile technology. It is designed for those seeking fundamental, practical working knowledge in areas related to the development, production, and operation of missiles and components. The course is comprehensive, to provide full coverage of new developments, and is coordinated to facilitate technical understanding and

improvement. A staff of military and civilian experts has been gathered from universities and industries engaged in missile research and development. The fields of study will include such current problems as guidance and ballistics, propulsion theory and design, reliability and astral problems.

Here in Washington, Georgetown University has announced a program at its law school to study both nuclear energy law and space law. An institute has been established to conduct intensive, continuing research into national and international legal problems arising out of the peaceful and military uses of nuclear energy and the exploration of outer space. Acknowledging the interrelation of political, economic, and technological factors, the university is calling on faculties of various universities and departments to combine in an interdisciplinary approach to legal problems of the nuclear-space age. The institute will be under the direction of the law faculty and will have the cooperation of an advisory committee of industrialists, scientists, and lawyers actively engaged in such matters.

Thus America's universities, and particularly these forward-looking institutions I have cited, are marshaling their resources to help study the tremendous potential of the space age. The country needs and welcomes the thoughtful, academic consideration and the broadening of the instruction base that these institutes offer.

Address by Representative Collier at Bataan Memorial Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the dedication speech by Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER on May 17, 1959, at the dedication of the Bataan Memorial.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, there is so little one can say or so little that need be said that could possibly reach the deep feelings which prevail on this occasion.

Certainly it would take volumes of words to even approach the emotions, human suffering, deeds of heroism, and love of country which are fully embraced in the history of Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion.

It is, in a sense, a small measure of fulfillment that in solemn gratitude and pride of community and country we dedicate this plaque in honor of a heroic group of soldiers who wrote an indelible chapter in the epic of the Pacific theater in World War II.

We have all learned much of the Maywood Tank Company which was the last of the American forces to cross the bridge from Bataan on the fiery night of January 7, 1942, before it was blown to bits by enemy shells.

The 192d Tank Battalion entered combat early in December of 1941 to engage in the struggle for Clark Field and it continued its fighting for more than a month, moving on to Luzon before its withdrawal into the Bataan Peninsula.

Against great odds it contributed in large measure to the prolonged defense of the peninsula, under the command of Col. Theodore F. Wickford, of Maywood.

It was a member of this company that brought down the first enemy plane to the credit of the armored forces in World War II.

It was here on this site exactly 30 years ago that the 33d Division Tank Company was activated and it was this division that was redesignated as the famous fighting Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion in 1940 when most of the nations of the world were already engaged in conflict.

In November of that year, Company B was ordered to active duty at Fort Knox, Ky., less than 2 months before the sneak attack upon Pearl Harbor which drew the United States into conflict.

The suffering of those who survived the horrible death march of Bataan has been described in the bitter accounts of the early struggle in the Philippines as was the further suffering which came in the Japanese prison camps.

The vicious fighting, the death march, and the maltreatment in the prison camps took their toll and left but few survivors of the original company.

I can't help but recall on this solemn and propitious occasion, words which Abraham Lincoln uttered at Philadelphia 95 years ago, because no one has ever been able to say in so few words the very thoughts in which we find the true meaning of this ceremony.

It was there he said, "We accepted this war and did not begin it."

"We accepted it for an object and when that object is accomplished, the war will end, and I hope to God that it will never end until that object is accomplished."

So it was with these war heroes of the Maywood Company, when they answered their call to make whatever sacrifice was necessary to remove from mankind the tyrants of that time.

And more significant, in the immortal address at Gettysburg, did Lincoln say those words which could be said in no better phrase or sentiments to fit this very occasion today:

"But in a larger sense," he solemnly declared, "we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground."

"The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract."

"It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work they have so nobly carried on."

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that the dead shall not have died in vain."

And then, we ask, who shall not have died in vain.

In our lifetime it means the hero dead of the great conflicts since the turn of the century.

They died to keep freedom alive.

They gave their all that we might continue to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We can make their deaths in vain by ignobly surrendering to those things which do not represent the way of life that has been our God-given heritage.

The hero dead of the last great world conflict and those who were spared from the supreme sacrifice were American patriots,

strong of body, strong of mind and spirit, and strong in their belief in God.

They did not hesitate to fight for the right as God gave them to see the right.

For if we but stop to appreciate the true values of our heritage we must, by the same token, concede that there can be no guarantee of life or liberty or the pursuit of happiness unless we know what it means to defend it with the same full measure as the men who fought on Bataan.

For those who died that we might be here today with the same traditions, ideals, and freedoms as the day they left these United States for the Pacific battlefields, the job is done.

And well done it was.

But our work and responsibility to do in our own way what must be done in preserving all of these things remains as a challenge.

For even as we are gathered here today, there are millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain of communism enslaved as the tyrants of our time would spread its godlessness and suppression of democracy around the world.

May the eternal light which will burn here on this spot after the light of each day has passed, for time immemorial be a reminder to each of us that the light of freedom may flicker and die if we, as Americans, falter in our responsibility to God and country in the years before us.

For those few who gave so much for so many, we must never forget.

Pay Rates for Employees at Airport Mail Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide that employees at airport mail facilities who handle high priority airmail should receive the rate of pay which is justified by the complexity of their duties.

Buffalo is proud of its beautiful airport. As a Member of Congress from Buffalo, and as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am interested in air traffic at the Buffalo Airport, and also in the quality of postal service that airport is capable of rendering.

The airport mail facility at Buffalo is staffed by a group of devoutly loyal employees of the postal transportation service. Were they to receive double their present rate of pay, their devotion to duty could hardly be increased.

Nevertheless, since having come to Congress, I have learned of the way in which the Postal Classification Act of 1955 was intended to provide equal pay for equal work. By the standards of complexity of duties, by the tension of making sure that mail moves without interruption between the closely connecting air flights, and by the standards of more elaborate as well as more frequently changing scheme requirements, postal employees assigned to airport mail facilities such as that at Buffalo should be granted level-5 pay.

Most distribution clerks in the postal service are assigned to level 4, with a starting salary of \$4,035 annually. The starting salary my bill proposes for airport mail facility clerks is \$4,275 annually, or just \$140 additional per year. This is just 55 cents per working day, or 7 cents per hour.

The Post Office Department has already authorized as high a rate of pay for some people who handle airmail in installations other than airport mail facilities. Under a job description titled "Mail Dispatch Expediter," which the Post Office Department has numbered 2-198, the Department has authorized one level-5 position when distribution is performed in accordance with authorized airmail schemes.

At airport mail facilities, not only is mail distributed in accordance with such schemes, but it also meets the more demanding test of close-coupled contact with airline personnel to insure that connections are accomplished and that the highest priority class of mail suffers no delay.

Because of considerations such as these, I hope that my bill may be given early attention, and that the existing injustices may be corrected.

Maritime Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week, May 22, we will observe Maritime Day. It seems fitting that in saluting the occasion we pause to consider what this means.

The security and well-being of every citizen depends on a strong merchant marine—traditionally operated as a private enterprise with the aid and cooperation of the Federal Government.

Both in peace and war, a strong merchant marine is essential to the strength of our country. A strong merchant fleet is necessary for the prosperity and stability of America's peacetime commerce and it becomes America's fourth arm of defense in times of national emergency.

During war years, American merchant ships were equipped with antiaircraft and heavier guns and merchant crews shared the gun stations with U.S. Navy gun crews.

In M-day or mobilization day plans, if the need should ever arise, the Navy would be responsible for the utilization and routing of merchant vessels. These ships would become naval auxiliaries for the transport of troops, munitions, fuel, and supplies.

In the security plan of the Nation, the ships of the American merchant marine are of prime importance and trained and efficient personnel for these ships is a natural concern of the Government.

It has been said that a ship is only as good as the men that sail her; therefore, if America is to have good ships, she must have good men aboard these ships.

Congress recognized this some years ago and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was signed into law. This called for Federal training of merchant officers and the act has often been referred to as the Magna Charta of the merchant marine. Standards were raised and, consequently, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point was dedicated in 1942.

THE CAMPUS OF THE SEVEN SEAS

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is located on the north shore of Long Island, near the confluence of Long Island Sound and the East River, in sight of the towering skyline of Manhattan.

Built and equipped at a cost of \$8 million, Kings Point occupies approximately a 65-acre site on Long Island Sound, a campus of the seven seas.

I have watched Kings Point grow from its very first day, when I attended the opening ceremonies as Nassau County commander of the American Legion, later during my 8 years in the Assembly of New York State as chairman of the military law committee and during my years in Congress; several times, I have served on the congressional Board of Visitors to Kings Point and on each occasion of a visit to the Academy I have been impressed by this "Annapolis of the Merchant Marine," its officers, and the cadets.

Every citizen should visit Kings Point and see this fine institution. Pause in the library and see the records made by cadets during World War 2 and read the tales of heroism.

The Academy's fine gymnasium, O'Hara Hall, is named after Ed O'Hara, a cadet from California. During a battle with a German raider, O'Hara, seeing the Navy gunners downed by enemy fire, took over the gun and dispatched the enemy to the bottom of the sea, but O'Hara was mortally wounded in the courageous action.

President Eisenhower on February 20, 1956, signed the bill that gave Kings Point permanent status, thereby placing it alongside West Point, Annapolis, the Coast Guard, and Air Force Academies as one of Uncle Sam's five Federal Academies for officer training.

It was a happy day for all hands, my fellow colleagues, STEVE DEROUNIAN and STUYV WAINWRIGHT, and I had worked long and hard to insure the final passage of the bill for permanency. John Scherger, chief clerk of the supreme court in Mineola and a very good friend, was president of the Association of Parents and Friends of Kings Point. The association had aided considerably in the battle for recognition.

TOP ADMIRAL, TOP STAFF

The Academy, under the capable direction of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, has advanced far in the field of higher education. The faculty is often called on for aid and cooperation in highly technical matters. Presently, several Academy officers are assigned to the building

of the *Savannah*, America's first atom-powered ship. Truly a remarkable testimonial to the knowledge and competence of the Academy staff.

SPARKLING SPORTS STAFF

Kings Point has also advanced in the world of college sports. Under Comdr. James W. Liebertz the Academy presents an intercollegiate sports program unequaled by any school its size.

Commander Liebertz was aide to Capt. Gene Tunney, who was in charge of the Navy's physical fitness program during World War II. The Kings Point athletic director is one of the Nations' most popular men in college athletics and his coaching staff includes two former great athletes from schools here in the Nation's Capitol—Clem Stralka, of Georgetown, and later a great line star with the Washington Redskins, and Tim Stapleton, a three-letter man at George Washington. Harry Wright, All-American from Notre Dame, took over last year as head football coach and the football fortunes started to rise to new heights. Lt. Comdr. Tom Carmody supervises the physical training program that has every cadet participating in physical development.

I might add that in addition to the educational and physical development of the cadet, there are the Academy chaplains, representing the three faiths, to aid the Kings Pointers' spiritual development.

The cadets spend 3 11-month years in residence at the Academy, plus a year of study and work aboard American vessels at sea. Upon successful completion of the course, which almost equals 5 years of regular college study, the degree of bachelor of science is awarded. Kings Pointers also complete courses qualifying them for U.S. Naval Reserve commissions.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in these short, yet action-packed years of existence has served the country well. We hope that Kings Point will continue to provide the young men who will be America's merchant marine officers and ambassadors of good will for many more peaceful maritime days.

Greetings to the Slovak League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Slovaks in America have for many years been very active in many phases of our communal life. Through the medium of various organizations they have rendered valuable services. The Slovak League of America, as a leading civic and cultural organization, working primarily in Slovak-American communities, has been known for more than 50 years as the agency for ministering to the material and spiritual needs of these communities, and also

educating immigrant Slovaks in the American democratic way of life. In greeting the 36th Congress of the league, I wish its organizing leaders success in their worthy endeavors.

The Conservation Reserve Authorized by the Soil Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conservation reserve authorized by the Soil Bank Act is a Federal program, which was supported by members of both parties. The program has been in operation for 3 years and during that time, it has established a remarkable record of accomplishment.

The conservation record is particularly impressive. During the time the program has been in operation, a total of 23 million acres has been placed in the reserve. In 1957, a total of 6 million acres was placed under contract. In 1958, a total of 4 million acres was placed under contract. In 1959, a total of 13 million acres was placed under contract and an additional 7 million acres was offered by the Nation's farmers but could not be placed in the reserve because the Department of Agriculture did not have a sufficient authorization to enter into contracts on this land.

On the first 10 million acres placed in the reserve during 1957 and 1958, establishment of protective cover has largely been completed. On this land, nearly 9 million acres are now covered with flourishing stands of grass which protects the soil from wind and water erosion, conserves the plant nutrients for further generations of Americans, and also contributes to the wildlife populations on this and adjacent lands. A truly remarkable accomplishment in this regard is the fact that in excess of 3 million acres of this grass has been established in the southern Great Plains, usually known as the dust bowl, where wind erosion has been a problem for over 30 years.

Another million acres have been planted to trees—a major contribution to forestry, wise land use, and conservation of soil and water on these lands.

On the 13 million acres placed in the reserve in 1959, final figures are not as yet available. On the basis of a sample projected to the entire acreage, it is estimated that on this land, 3 million acres are already established with a satisfactory cover, 8,500,000 acres are to be planted to grass, 700,000 acres are to be planted to trees, 150,000 acres are to be developed as wildlife cover, and the balance to be established in temporary cover, water conservation measures, etc.

The impact of the program on conservation has equaled or exceeded the highest expectations of the various conservation groups who supported the original legislation.

Among the many favorable aspects of the conservation reserve, one of the most noteworthy is the wildlife phase. It is particularly noteworthy because the benefits of the program to wildlife extends to such a widespread segment of the general public. Both urban and rural people enjoy hunting and fishing. In fact, one of every five Americans over 12 years of age fished and/or hunted during recent years. This army of sportsmen supported the original legislation and has been enthusiastic over the increase in wildlife which has already taken place.

Sportsmen in such States as Ohio, Georgia, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington, and Michigan have reported greatly improved hunting on lands in and near conservation reserve acres. Game and fish department figures show almost a 100 percent increase in pheasant population during the past 2 years in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa. Wildlife population increases have been reported in every State where substantial acreages have been placed in the conservation reserve.

Conservationists recognize and approve the wildlife improvements resulting from the program and credit the increase to the 10 million acres placed in the reserve through 1958. Similar benefits are anticipated from the 13 million acres added in 1959. They also expect comparable benefits if the program were carried forward to the ultimate goal of 60 million acres originally contemplated for placing in the conservation reserve.

These conservation interests and sportsmen are unable to understand why a program, so successful and of such widespread benefit, should now be crippled by two actions of the Appropriation Committee.

The limitation on the 1960 authorization to \$325 million dollars will almost halt placing additional land in the program. The 2.3 million acres that can be added within this limit will hold the program to 25 million acres—far from the 60 million acre goal.

Even worse is the action of the committee in setting a \$3,000 maximum contract limitation. This will in effect make it almost impossible to add any land to the reserve next year.

The conservation reserve program has demonstrated its ability to encourage farmers voluntarily to reduce production. It has made possible a substantial land use adjustment, which contributes to soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation. It deserves continued bipartisan support.

DAV Services in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation

services freely extended to thousands of West Virginia citizens has recently been brought to my attention. Again, these splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressional chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in West Virginia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veterans' organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its Central Office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SERVICE FACILITIES IN WEST VIRGINIA

The DAV maintains a full-time national service officer in West Virginia, Mr. Henry E. Smith, located in the VA regional office, 832 Fifth Avenue, in Huntington. The department commander is Mr. Paul M. Elliott, and the department adjutant is Mr. Gus Loiseau, of Parkersburg.

There are four VA hospitals in West Virginia, in each of which the DAV has a voluntary services representative, as follows: Mr. James B. Taylor, Jr., at Beckley, with 200 beds for general medical patients; Mr. Edward C. Wereley, at Clarksburg, with 184 beds for general medical patients; Mrs. Esther M. Darling, at Huntington, with 180 beds, general medical; and Mr. Earl T. Rosensteel, at

Martinsburg, with 1,400 beds at the VA center.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$63,813,000 for its veteran program in West Virginia, including \$17,738,910 disability compensation to its 20,083 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in West Virginia furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent, 1,558, are members of the 35 DAV chapters in West Virginia.

SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENT BY DAV

This 8 percent is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of West Virginia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)-----	42,816
Claims folders reviewed-----	35,680
Appearances before rating boards-----	13,276
Compensation increases obtained-----	1,815
Service connections obtained-----	786
Nonservice pensions-----	740
Death benefits obtained-----	59
Total monetary benefits obtained-----	\$1,000,470.39

These figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for West Virginia veterans their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individual advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former

buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed, because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in West Virginia with a consequent loss of about \$280,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in West Virginia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experi-

ence of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identio-Tag (miniature automobile license tags) Project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identio-Tag department, 2,992 of whom, during the last 8 years, were West Virginia residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all service claimants, DAV members and other social minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every

DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of West Virginia.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in West Virginia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington 4, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations: The United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Disabled American Veterans. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV. I am proud to be a member of the DAV, as well as a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Amvets.

Imports of Canadian Bread in the Detroit Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press news item datelined Lansing, Mich., described a serious problem that has developed in the city of Detroit because of the free importation of Canadian bread. This dispatch quotes two State senators, Harold M. Ryan and Raymond C. Dziedzic, who have urged the Michigan Legislature to appeal to Congress to "rectify the inequity of free bread imports" from Windsor, Canada.

The two senators pointed out that while bread imported from Canada is duty free the Canadian Government levies a tariff on traffic in the other direction. Senator Ryan cited the fact that Canadian bakers work for 85 cents

an hour less than the current scale in Detroit and that flour costs \$1.25 less per hundredweight in Canada. These basic inequities have naturally created unfair competition for the Detroit bakers. The flood of imported bread has reached the staggering figure of 400,000 loaves every month and it has forced Detroit's bakeries to slash prices drastically in a futile attempt to remain competitive.

While this problem would be serious enough in any American city, it is particularly ominous in Detroit. As you all know, the State of Michigan is one of the leading centers of unemployment in this country with Detroit itself contributing vast numbers to the rolls of the relief-eligible. The unfair competition experienced by the baking industry in Detroit comes on top of an already bad situation in the automobile industry where, despite a favorable rate of auto sales so far this year, many skilled workers are without jobs.

It was not too long ago that one of our most highly esteemed colleagues, the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed, spoke out against the severe domestic problems that were being created by unregulated auto imports. On February 2, 1959, referring to a speech made by Mr. Ernest R. Breech of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Reed said:

The next time the free-trade advocates from Detroit express concern over unemployment in that area, they might well give some thought to the fact that the difference between the jobs displaced by imported autos and the jobs created by auto exports showed a net deficit of 28,900 jobs. That conservative estimate is no insubstantial number of unemployed American citizens, the vast majority of them in Michigan.

Our late colleague went on to compute the monetary loss to America caused by this unemployment to be in excess of \$200 million for the 12-month period preceding his remarks. Just think of that—\$200 million in wages lost because of imported automobiles—and then tell me that our so-called free trade is actually free.

The same lack of reciprocity that is crippling the baking industry in Detroit has been injuring our auto industry for years. In 1957, 2 years ago, the United States imported 95,510 automobiles from the United Kingdom and 100,083 automobiles from West Germany. And how many cars do you suppose we sold in those two countries in the same year? Britain allowed only 265 American autos to be imported and a scant 576 cars of our manufacture managed to hurdle the trade barriers of West Germany. And this is the phenomenon that some of us refer to as reciprocal trade.

Returning to the cross-border competition in the importation of bread my hometown of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., felt the seriousness of the situation when Our Own Bakery was forced to cease operation and put 60 men out of work. This bakery was confronted with competing with Canadian bread imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Canada.

The 11th Congressional District of Michigan has also suffered because of the importation of hardwood plywood. For many years certain areas of my dis-

trict have been dependent upon the plywood industry for the employment of its citizens. Up until the year 1951 the domestic industry was not too greatly affected by the imports of plywood, as the imports in 1951 consisted of 67 million square feet, and the domestic consumption at that time was 827 million square feet. But when we look at the statistics of imports we find that 4 years later in 1955 the imports had grown to 628 million square feet. The domestic consumption had increased about 100 percent to 1.5 billion square feet. The ratio of the imports was 10 times greater in the year 1955 over the year 1951. The foreign producers gain has been at the expense of the domestic industry with a consequent loss of jobs for our citizens. The towns of Escanaba, Gladstone, Newberry, and Munising, Mich., have drastically felt the impact of such imports, with some plants forced to close their doors, not temporarily, but permanently.

And remember that the problems presented by foreign imports faces all of us; it is not only the bakers, the unemployed woodworkers, the unemployed automobile workers, or the Treasury Department that must bear the expense of our free trade foreign policy. This policy steals money from the pockets of every single U.S. citizen, from every business concern, and from every American industry.

Something must be done before this wasteful, irresponsible doctrine has stolen our country right out from under us.

The Labor-Management Performance Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1959

Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, ranking Republican on the House Labor Committee, introduced a new labor reform measure in the House today. "Weeks of hearings in the House, together with the public reaction against the Kennedy bill as passed by the Senate, demonstrate the need for a new approach to labor reform," said Congressman KEARNS at a press conference this morning. "I think we've been on the wrong track thus far. We need a new look."

"The heart of the labor reform problem is the breakdown in performance under existing laws. Whether the failure is in the law or its enforcement is an open question. The result is that the fundamental rights of the working men and women of this country definitely are not being protected."

"The breakdown is most serious when it fails to provide lack of protection against internal union abuses and to oust the criminal elements from the union movement. Union members can sometimes obtain relief from internal union problems through use

of the courts but it is a long and expensive process. Few rank and file union members can afford the time or the money. In the criminal area the congressional hearings have clearly exposed an appalling failure of enforcement.

"Nevertheless, the Senate act relies on court enforcement of its watered down bill of rights and on criminal penalties for most of the rest of its provisions. Such legislation is no more than a repetition of the same old theme song: 'Let the house of labor take care of itself.'

"My new bill offers a fresh approach. It is based on the recognition that, if the corrupt element is to be eliminated from the labor movement, the major part of the responsibility rests on the membership of any union to do its own housecleaning. Personally, I think they will do it if they are given the necessary tools and real protection while the job is being done. This bill does exactly that.

"The bill contains a simple but comprehensive bill of rights which will go a long way toward insuring that control of the union will be in the hands of the members rather than the officials. Independently audited financial reports are required but the bill recognizes that regardless of where the reports are filed, only union members will be sufficiently well-informed to question them. Thus it provides that the reports must be given to union members only. By far the great majority of union leaders and employers are honest Americans; therefore, no reports are required of labor officials or employers. Such reports are aimed only at wrongdoers and it is ridiculous to think a criminal is going to write us a report of his crime.

"Enforcement procedure is of paramount importance. The bill contains a simple, well-tested method—the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. All the member need do is file a charge of violation of the bill of rights or the reporting provisions, and the NLRB takes over the investigation and prosecution of his case. He is protected from retaliation while the case is processed. The confidence which rank and file workmen have in the Board is amply demonstrated by the fact that last quarter they filed 62 percent of the Board's unfair labor practice cases. The bill also includes important changes in Board structure to speed up its case handling."

Congressman KEARNS stated further, "Any labor reform measure must include restrictions on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. Emotions run high on these issues, but both unions and employers are inclined to forget the impact of such activities on the working men and women who suffer as a result. Their right to be free of such coercion must be preserved if the freedom of association guaranteed by the Wagner Act is to mean anything.

"My new bill prevents picketing after a union loses an NLRB election and, at the same time, markedly speeds up NLRB procedure for holding such elections. It also stops picketing where the labor organization involved cannot establish that 30 percent of the employees want the union to represent them.

"In the secondary boycott area, there are presently restrictions on inducement of secondary employees. They are retained and a ban on threats, restraint and coercion of any person added. Hot cargo contracts are also outlawed.

"Believe me, the time has come to assure a greater voice to the union member in calling strikes. It is obvious that union officials must compete with each other to get the maximum wage increase for their members. Too often the members lose money as a result, either from lost wages or inflation caused by the increase. Consequently,

the bill provides for a secret ballot strike vote to be taken within 7 days prior to commencement of any strike.

"There are many other provisions in the bill, which it is impossible to explain in detail in this release. However, they likewise definitely provide practical methods of protecting the rights of individual workmen.

"The Performance Act of 1959 is the least restrictive on the activities of legitimate unions of any bill presently before the House. It provides far fewer opportunities for harassment of honest unions. At the same time, in my opinion, it provides the union member with the only practical, realistic method of enforcing his rights that can be found in any of the bills introduced.

"As a Member of Congress for 13 years, serving on the distinguished House Labor Committee, I believe that this bill offers the greatest opportunity for harmonious labor-management relations, and protection to the public, of any approach yet conceived."

The Danger of Nasserism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, as it appeared in the April 1959 issue of *B'nai Zion Voice*:

THE DANGER OF NASSERISM

(By Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

The grave situation in the Middle East constitutes a most serious challenge to the free world today.

As I read the latest dispatches from the Middle East, I am especially mindful of many early warnings against Nasserism and its true character. Instead of facing the unpleasant facts, we helped to build up the Egyptian military adventurer. We fed his imperialistic ambitions in the naive belief that he would, in gratitude, identify himself with the West.

It should have been apparent to anyone who could read Nasser's own words as set down in his book, "The Philosophy of the Revolution," the "Mein Kampf" of pan-Arabism—that Nasser was motivated by violent hatred of the West and by dreams of empire at the very outset of his political career. But our State Department preferred to view the matter otherwise, and we all but begged to be blackmailed.

The inevitable results were the weakening of our prestige and influence throughout the whole area, the perpetuation of the Arab-Israel conflict as Nasser's best instrument for promoting the tensions on which his dictatorship feeds, and the entry of Soviet power on the Middle East scene through Nasser.

Nasser's forces are working overtime to convince the American people that Nasserism and Arab nationalism are synonymous and that we have no choice but to swallow our dislike of Nasser and come to terms with him. This devious argument, which some misrepresent as hardheaded realism, would be more persuasive if one did not know the history of the power struggle within the Arab world and the essential weakness of strong men like Nasser, whose sole strength has been his ability to play off East against

West. He has no indigenous strength. Even with the military aid and political support of the Kremlin, he was ignominiously defeated by little Israel, and he is being increasingly resisted and challenged by Arab countries like Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq.

Add to this the opposition of Turkey and Iran, the growing resentment against Nasserist aims in Libya and Sudan, and the forthright action of President Bourguiba of Tunisia in breaking off relations with Nasser. The picture is not one of an invincible man of destiny marching from conquest to conquest, but of a political mirage going the way of all such fantasies of the desert.

The task before the West is clear. Our previous policy of massive appeasement of Nasser must be permanently replaced by a policy of massive containment.

Let no one intimidate us into believing that by pursuing such a policy we will be standing in opposition to Arab nationalism. America has provided the greatest impetus to Arab nationalism. It was at our initiative and under our leadership that the old imperialism were withdrawn from the Middle East. We fostered the political independence of all the Arab States and have lavished assistance of all kinds on these countries.

We are today prepared to continue our help to the underdeveloped Arab countries and ill-used Arab peoples. But we should not be prepared to equate Nasserism with the legitimate national aspirations of the Arab peoples, which we support.

I have already urged that we set ourselves the goal of establishing a stable economy in the Middle East, on a regional basis. That is the first thing we must do if we are to get peace.

In urging that a program of economic assistance in the Middle East should be pursued, however, I wish to make it clear that I do not believe that such assistance, if applied through the United Nations, should be given to nations which fail to observe the United Nations Charter, which explicitly prohibits economic boycott and belligerency of the kind now being waged by the Arab States against Israel.

At the same time, I believe that countries like Israel, which are clearly and unmistakably linked with the United States, in the worldwide struggle for democracy and against communism, should receive expanded aid directly from the United States on the basis of bilateral agreements.

Where Israel is concerned, even those who had blindly opposed its establishment must now admit that it stands as the major bastion of Western strength in the Middle East.

The moral and material support we have rendered to Israel—and such support has been largely bipartisan in character—must be viewed not only as a matter of aiding justice, but also as an extraordinarily vital expression of enlightened self-interest.

For if—Heaven forbid—Israel should ever fall, the Middle East would be finally opened up to the domination first of Nasserism, and next to the domination of Communist imperialism centered in Moscow. Then the hopes of the free world in that part of the world would vanish—and with them our hopes for Africa, and large parts of Asia, and perhaps even of Europe.

Neither the people of Israel themselves, with their magnificent though small defenses, nor the public opinion of the whole Western World, would ever permit this.

In the light of the bonds by which history and fate have linked the destinies of the peoples of Israel and the United States, is it not time to give full and unqualified public expression to this relationship?

Our Government has shown friendship and support for Israel in many ways—but it has not yet publicly proclaimed our determination to maintain Israel's political independence and territorial integrity, come what may. It makes absolutely no sense to

argue that a declaration by our Government to this effect would tend to stir up resentment and latent hostility against America within the Arab world. Our past reserve on this subject has certainly not served to check the barrage of anti-American propaganda emanating from Cairo.

Indeed, the inhibition we have imposed upon ourselves in order to appease Arab extremists has had the very opposite effect; it has encouraged them to believe that we are not unequivocally committed to Israel's defense and that by hammering away at America for being friendly to Israel, they may induce us to withdraw our support from Israel altogether. I believe, therefore, that a categorical warning that an attack against Israel would be dealt with as a threat to the security of the free world is the best way of tranquilizing the atmosphere surrounding the Arab-Israel conflict.

This policy, forcefully stated and resolutely pursued and implemented by American leadership in the United Nations, would be the prelude to peace and mutual cooperation among the peoples of the area for the benefit of future generations and for the good of mankind.

George Washington Day Dinner, American Good Government Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Good Government Society calls to memory the enduring contributions of George Washington to good government in this country by holding a public George Washington Day dinner here in the Nation's Capital. On these occasions the society's annual George Washington Awards are presented to two people for their outstanding contributions to good government in our own times.

Among the previous recipients of the George Washington Awards are the late Robert A. Taft, Harry Flood Byrd, Herbert Hoover, Allan Shivers, Howard W. Smith, Robert E. Wood, the late Walter F. George, George M. Humphrey, Karl E. Mundt, William M. Colmer, Richard B. Russell, and William F. Knowland. This year the recipients of the George Washington Awards of the American Good Government Society were JOHN L. McCLELLAN and Lewis L. Strauss.

The awards were presented at the 1959 George Washington Day dinner attended by more than 700 ladies and gentlemen on Thursday, April 30, the 170th anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

On behalf of the trustees of the American Good Government Society, U.S. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, made the presentation to Secretary Strauss and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, made the presentation to Senator McCLELLAN.

I offer for the RECORD Representative HALLECK's remarks on making the presentation to Senator McCLELLAN, the cita-

tion from the George Washington Award and Senator McCLELLAN's response:

Mr. Chairman, all of you folks, I am happy and proud to be a part of this wonderful evening. I would like to say first of all that I note with approval that the purpose of the Good Government Society is to promote the education of the American public in the principles of the Constitution and of free competitive enterprise. Now certainly this is a worthy objective, and I would like to observe, in passing, that good government is government according to these principles.

Tonight it is my singular privilege to present the Society's George Washington Award to a man who has made a unique contribution to the preservation of these principles, the Honorable Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas. If you will pardon a personal note, I have not only worked with him as a colleague in the Congress but I've been hunting and fishing a few times with JOHN, and I mean it when I say that he's a great guy any place you find him. [Applause.]

I think you will all agree that the primary purpose of government under our Constitution is the protection of personal liberty. The Constitution has given Congress the legislative power to provide this protection against both our enemies—those from without and those within our own society who would encroach upon our liberty.

The power to investigate is an essential component of the legislative process if the Congress is to perform its function intelligently and effectively. It is a power, however, which must be used with the utmost fairness and restraint.

As chairman of a select committee, Senator McCLELLAN has labored long and well to bring to the attention of Congress and the American public the abuses that are today threatening the personal liberty of many hard-working Americans. JOHN McCLELLAN has won the gratitude and respect of all right-thinking Americans for the fearless and fair manner in which he has carried on his investigations. [Applause.]

In these days when Congress is fair game for everybody, no Member of Congress has done more to enhance public esteem of Congress as a champion of the human rights guaranteed by the Constitution than has Senator McCLELLAN. [Applause.] And no man has done more to improve the understanding of the investigative functions of the Congress of the United States.

JOHN McCLELLAN has shown a deep devotion to the Constitution and the free-enterprise system, and so all of us who love him and respect him and admire him applaud him for the great job he has done.

JOHN, [applause] this says: "Resolution and Tribute and Honor.

"JOHN L. McCLELLAN, lawyer, statesman, and patriot, has devoted a quarter-century to the service of the people of Arkansas and of the United States—as prosecuting attorney, as Representative in Congress, and, the last 17 years, in the U.S. Senate. At 17, having passed the examinations, he was admitted to the Arkansas bar by special act of legislature.

"Among his notable achievements have been the adoption by Congress of many recommendations of the Hoover Commissions—on both of which he served with distinction; the enactment of community property income tax law; and the exposure of corruption and tyranny in labor unions, which deny the constitutional rights of union members. For 20 years he has been an advocate of flood prevention, and the development of the Nation's water resources.

"Courage and integrity, wisdom and suasive power have indelibly marked Senator McCLELLAN's work for efficient government and for liberty—the sum total of human rights. He is Arkansas' most illustrious son.

"For the board of trustees, American Good Government Society, Burks Summers, president, and J. Harvie Williams, secretary, April 30, 1959."

JOHN, good for you. [Applause.]

SENATOR McCLELLAN'S RESPONSE

Thank you, CHARLIE. I only regret that you couldn't have started that speech in the Senate, where I could have yielded all the time you want. You have been very generous with your flattery, and I, like all human beings and particularly Irishmen, like it when it is favorable. I wish you might have continued.

Mr. Toastmaster, President Summers, Admiral Strauss, distinguished guests, my colleagues, members of the society, my friends, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not merely difficult—it is just about impossible—for me to express the extent and depth of my appreciation for the high honor which you have so graciously conferred upon me here this evening. To say that I am happily surprised is a gross understatement.

Indeed, I can hardly reconcile this happening with reality, for it had never even remotely occurred to me that I had ever done anything to be worthy of the George Washington Award of your splendid organization or to be deserving of the enviable recognition which you have accorded me tonight. To be so honored by your distinguished society overwhelms me, and I take great pride in it and have a greater appreciation for it when I contemplate what this society stands for, the kind of government that it supports and approves, as has been so ably referred to here and been so ably described in the wonderful address we have just heard by my distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER. [Applause.] This is indeed a marvelous tribute, and it is one that I shall always cherish and treasure.

I accept this notable award with profound gratitude and humility, but I cannot—and I do not—accept it in my own right and for myself alone. But I accept it for and on behalf of my family—for Mrs. McClellan, my loving wife and devoted companion, and for my precious and wonderful children. [Applause.] For, if I have ever done anything to deserve this, if my labors and my feeble efforts have in any way, even in the smallest measure, contributed to good government, the national security, and the public welfare, I readily and proudly acknowledge that the larger share of the credit is due them. Their faith and their abiding trust have constantly inspired and sustained me. Without their confidence and encouragement many, many times I might well have faltered and failed.

Then, too, I should like to accept this award in the name of my native State, the great State of Arkansas, and her people, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.] Except for their suffrage, their support, and the trust that they have reposed in me, I could never have had the high privilege of serving or the opportunity to serve in the National Congress; and to them I am eternally indebted and thankful.

And may I say to you fellows, Governor, and all of our friends in Arkansas, I am happy indeed that you have come here tonight. You indeed honor me greatly. [Applause.]

When I meditate upon the affairs of state and reflect upon what constitutes good government, there comes to my mind a story that illustrates to me a great truth and one that maybe we should all relearn, observe, and remember. It is said that on one occasion a minister of a tiny country church asked a celebrated actor, who happened to be present in his audience, to render for the congregation the 23d psalm. The great actor readily agreed. He rose and in a most eloquent manner dramatized the beautiful passages of the 23d psalm. His efforts were an

overwhelming example of forensic oratory. But when he sat down, the minister turned to a humble parishioner, a man of simple words, and asked him if he too would recite the same psalm. The poor parishioner stood up, fully conscious of his plain clothes, his face weather-beaten, and his lack of training in the art of public speaking. But he began reciting, "The Lord is my shepherd * * *" and, as he continued, the congregation listened with consecrated attention. When he ended, there were tears in the eyes of the church members. They had been stirred and moved to a state of reverence and devout worship.

After the services, the minister asked the great actor why it was that the parishioners were more impressed by the words of the simple workman than they had been by his. The great actor hesitated a moment, and then he said, "Well, I knew the psalm, he knew the psalm, but he also knows the author."

So we hold that governments are instituted among men to secure and maintain certain basic and unalienable human rights. Among those fundamentals that we foster, cherish, and seek to preserve are equality, liberty, and justice for all, under the authority of law that is derived from the consent of the governed, and not by dictatorial powers arrogated by men unto themselves. [Applause.]

If we are to have good government, these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," must have their meaning and be a part of our being. They must live in our hearts as well as in our minds. In short, we must "know the author," for I believe the indestructible principles embodied in these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," have upon them the divine seal, and that "good government" as our highest political aims has the approbation of His divine will.

I have heard my friend speak here this evening. His remarks and his address reminded us of the conditions that prevail in the world today and conditions that unhappily prevail here in our own country. They point out to us the gravity of dangers that may threaten us and the crises that may be impending. Since this is the 170th anniversary of the occupancy of the Presidency of the United States, I think it might be well for us, therefore, to reconsecrate and rededicate ourselves and our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, to the preservation of the land that we love. That is what I shall try to do. Thank you. [Applause.]

The Modern Crusade of the Innocents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, Congress by its action in either accepting or rejecting legislation to provide Federal grants to the States for education may well establish a policy which will be far reaching. In fact, historians of the future will probably refer back to this session of Congress and our decision on Federal aid to education as having an important influence on generations to come in America and what is in store for this Nation.

Recently, two Members of the other body with conflicting views discussed the

subject, "Is Federal Aid to Education Necessary?" on the "American Forum of the Air." I have a transcript of this debate.

The Senator who was opposed to the Murray-Metcalf bill said it would lead to the Federal Government controlling the schools and in turn it would lead to the Federal Government prescribing the curriculum of our schools.

This Senator said: "When it does that, you've a dictatorship. That is the way Hitler and Mussolini arose in their countries."

The other Senator did not agree. Then he added, and these are his actual words:

"But even if it were true, I would suggest the possibility that it would be the lesser of the evils of not giving our children a decent education."

Mr. Speaker, I found this statement shocking, but even more disturbing to me is the way certain educators themselves ignore history. For example, all my friends in education agree with me and oppose Federal strings and control. Yet they are blind to history and will not see that it is impossible to remove control from the financing of schools. Japan is a good example of this power of the purse and central thought control. There before the war, organizations like chambers of commerce and of course all municipal functions of government were dependent for funds to exist from the Central Government, and why educators, of all people, would naively believe it would be different in America is beyond me.

The latest evidence of a misguided educator came to me in the form of letters forwarded by a teacher.

Hereafter is one of these letters which is typical of them all. After it, is my reply and the accompanying comment to the teacher. I think all three letters form a composite picture which recalls the Children's Crusade in Old World Europe. I wonder if unwittingly this 20th century Pied Piper could not be leading her innocent boy and girl students into oblivion and modern slavery. For myself, I do not consider such a risk the lesser of two evils and in all conscience I shall continue to actively oppose Federal control of our educational system.

These are the letters to which I refer:

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Lately I have heard so many good things about you because you are such an outstanding man. So I am telling you from the bottom of my heart to please vote for schools, because we need your help for the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Now would you like to hear something about myself. I have two hobbies, horses and dogs. I have a dog called Susie.

My father works at Peter Thomas Co. My mother doesn't work.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR THIRD GRADE STUDENTS: Your letters have reached me. When I was your age and in the third grade I went to Summit School. The same building still stands. It is at Union Street and Summit Avenue. Since I

am a grandfather, you can tell it is getting to be an old building indeed.

Seattle, just like other places in the United States, needs new school buildings particularly I think to replace portables which get quite stuffy in winter.

The necessary money to construct such new schools and get good teachers of course must come from the citizens who live in Seattle, regardless of whether the city, the county, the State of Washington, or the Federal Government taxes these people to pay for them.

The Constitution of the United States does not call for the National Government to finance education and building of such schools. The Constitution of the State of Washington, on the other hand, accepts responsibility and guarantees an education to you and each other child in Seattle.

The reason our forefathers left education to the individual States was for fear of a dictatorship and a President of a king such as George III of England gaining control of our schools and telling each teacher what to teach. Thus Federal control could come about if special requirements were attached to accepting Federal money.

Before Pearl Harbor the people of Japan were under "thought control" made possible by financing of Japanese schools by the Central Government of Japan.

I have urged the Congress of the United States to recognize the needs of our schools and pass a law so as to have the Secretary of the Treasury send back a part of the income tax paid by each State to that State to be used for schools in the way each State decides it wants to use the money.

Your teacher told you and each member of your class to write me to vote for a different kind of a law. She has told you to tell me to support the Murray-Metcalf bill which would provide Federal grants to the States for use not only in constructing new schools but also for paying her and other teachers higher salaries.

I am sure she deserves better pay and I am sure your parents and the school board members elected to manage the Seattle schools want to increase it. As a matter of fact, if all property was valued and taxed properly and fairly in our State the problem would be simplified.

Many well-intentioned people are now urging Federal aid to education as a solution. But other equally well-intentioned people believe if the Federal Government once starts in granting money for teachers' salaries, its role will be expanded and new Government-selected books and other school needs will be added to these federally financed items. That will in time pave the way, some of us believe, to central control and the way opened for regimentation of all schoolchildren into one pattern of thought. History could repeat itself. We could have a Hitler in America under such a system.

I want you to know that your school and the education of every child in America is very important to me.

As the Representative in Congress of the northern part of Seattle and King County, which has had and will continue to have a huge increase in school population, I intend to do all I can to meet this problem without endangering principles that are basic to our way of life, such as the freedom from any form of "thought control," the right to think and make our own decisions free from any influence, kindly or otherwise.

I have two granddaughters attending McGilvra Grammar School. One is in kindergarten and one in the first grade. In a couple of years they will be in the third grade just like you are and I hope they too will be able to express themselves as eloquently as you have in your letters to me. It goes without saying that I want only the best in life for them, just as I do for you,

and I know this can be accomplished without jeopardizing our intellectual freedom.

Thank you for writing to me as you have.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR MISS: I am enclosing a single reply to the various letters from your third-grade students which you forwarded to me. I am sorry that I cannot talk to your class personally. Instead I hope you will act as my representative in reading the enclosed letter to them.

Children should take an early interest in civics and matters of concern to our country. However, in this instance I believe that perhaps unwittingly you have acted unwisely in using your third-grade students in what amounts to spreading propaganda for legislation in which you have a personal interest and the real implication of which obviously is over their heads. My reaction to their letters would be the same regardless of whether your students were urging support of or opposition to the Murray-Metcalfe bill. I am sure you realize that many of the parents of the children attending our public schools are strongly opposed to Federal aid to education. Furthermore, while I do not impugn your motives, to me it is not proper to use children in this way.

The National Education Association, the Washington State Education Association, and on down through the various State and local groups, interested in and dedicated to the improvement and advancement of our educational system, perform an essential service in providing information. I value their help and although I am not always in agreement with the position taken by these various organizations and their representatives, I nevertheless appreciate their objectives and respect their point of view.

That I oppose Federal strings to school dollars is a matter of record. However, I am also conscious of the critical financial need facing our school system. It was in this connection that I initiated H.R. 4079, which would return a percentage of the Federal income tax to the various States to be used in any way those States themselves deem advisable, in the field of education and with no Federal controls of any nature.

Any other type of bill, it is my belief, could result in the Government censoring textbooks, so to speak, and occupying a seat on each school board in America.

I hope you will accept my letter in the spirit in which it is intended. The right to petition is in the Constitution, but this does not include the right of a teacher-guardian to use children in spreading propaganda.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

States Should Be Reimbursed for Building Modern Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a

statement I submitted to the House Committee on Public Works in connection with its current hearings on legislation to reimburse States for expenditures incurred in the construction of roads which were subsequently incorporated into the Interstate Highway System. Among these measures is also my bill H.R. 6409, which I introduced on April 15, 1959. The text of my statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 19, 1959, ON H.R. 6303 AND H.R. 6409

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views in support of the bill, H.R. 6303, introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, my own bill H.R. 6409 which is similar in content, and related bills. The purpose of all these bills is to equitably reimburse the States for toll and free roads which were incorporated into Interstate and Defense Highways of the Nation.

Several years ago Congress had authorized the construction of an interstate system of roads and highways of 41,000 miles extending into all parts of the country, in order to meet present-day highway needs as well as defense needs. This should have been undertaken several years earlier because of the growing needs. Some of our States had the vision and foresight to realize the immensity of our traffic and highway problems and they could not wait until Congress made up its mind. They were confronted with the problems and the only logical solution was to begin construction of roads.

This they did, and they built them well. The upshot was that in numerous instances these roads were later incorporated into the Interstate System and in these past few years they have been carrying a heavy traffic load. Let us not overlook the fact that those States which were the largest contributors to the Interstate System have the heaviest traffic demands and largest use.

Statistics show that a total of 10,954 miles built and financed by States have thus been incorporated into the Interstate System, and the cost of construction of these roads is given as more than \$6 billion. The bills under consideration would reimburse the States for this expenditure, but less the States' share of the cost and less Federal payments already made. Thus, the total net reimbursable amount for all States would come to \$4,295,600,000, which is roughly about 70 percent of the entire outlay. These reimbursements, however, are not to be made at once, but over a 15-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1962.

As for my own State of New York, it had been allocated a total of 1,227 miles of roads under the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act. New York, however, was one of those States that had the foresight to start building modern highways several years before the 1956 measure was enacted. New York took the initiative in the construction of such highways as the New York State Thruway and other roads, but it did so in the expectation that some sort of reimbursement would be made at some future date. In this way, New York was a pioneering State, it had spent about a billion dollars on the thruway alone.

Of the 1,227 miles allocated to New York, 658.2 miles of roads are financed through Federal aid and 568.8 miles were financed by New York State at a cost of \$1,036 million. If the Federal Government had contributed 90 percent of the cost, as it has done for all interstate highway construction under the 1956 act, New York would have been entitled to receive \$932,600,000 from the Government. Actually, New York received

only \$133,500,000, which means that it has a legitimate claim for the reimbursement of \$799 million.

It is for this very reason that I introduced my bill. I feel that New York is justly entitled to this refund. In fact, 3 years ago when we debated the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act on this floor, I stated at that time New York was already entitled to a reimbursement of \$650 million and that it should not be penalized because it had the initiative to go ahead with its road program and could not wait until the Federal Government determined its course of action.

Mr. Chairman, the New York State delegation in Congress has nearly always shown consistency in support of legislation which is not only beneficial to our State, but to the Nation as a whole. We have never acted in a provincial manner despite the fact that the people of New York contribute nearly one-fifth of the tax collections of the Government. I, therefore, urge you to approve this bill and to reimburse each State to the share to which it is entitled.

Come to Oregon's Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, has written a fine article entitled "Oregon's Big Birthday Party" in the Eagle for June 1959. No one knows better than DICK NEUBERGER how to sing the praises of Oregon.

I hope many of our colleagues and readers of the RECORD will have an opportunity to come to air-conditioned Oregon to join in the celebration of its 100th birthday. Under a previous consent I include the text of Senator NEUBERGER's article:

OREGON'S BIG BIRTHDAY PARTY

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(The author: U.S. Senator from Oregon, and a veteran member of Portland Aerie, FOE)

In that distant year when Hawaii celebrates the first centennial of its statehood, its Pacific Coast sister State of Oregon will be 200 years old. This is another way of emphasizing that 1959 marks the 100th anniversary of Oregon's admission to the Union. While activities celebrating congressional passage of Hawaiian statehood are dying down in the colorful islands, Oregonians are just beginning a festive year full of activities commemorating their admission day, which occurred on the eve of the Civil War.

Vacations on this last great frontier are always exciting, but Oregon, in 1959, is putting forth a special effort to make the tourist season a memorable one. Portland will be the site of a huge exposition and international trade fair from June 10 to September 17 and all Eagle Aeries in the State are participating in the promotion of this event. More than 50 foreign nations will submit exhibits.

Furthermore, such traditional Oregon events as the Portland Rose Festival, Ashland Shakespearean Festival, and Pendleton Roundup will be far more elaborate and extensive in tribute to the fact that Oregon has achieved the ripe old age of 100. Many gala events fight for attention on the crowded centennial calendar.

The Eagle who brings his family to Portland, the State's largest city, in June for the opening of the exposition and trade fair will be caught up in the Mardi Gras-like excitement of the famed Rose Festival. The favorite flower of the city of roses will be the featured attraction—from the new Zoological Gardens, where a miniature streamlined train winds through wooded hills around one of the West's most elaborate garden areas, to the grand floral parade downtown.

On the nearby white slopes of Mount Hood, the flower will be saluted in the Golden Rose ski tournament. Headquarters for this extraordinary climax to a spring celebration is Timberline Lodge. The only inn of its type in the Nation's 153 national forests, Timberline Lodge offers a host of attractions for the winter sports fan or casual visitor, including many examples of native Northwest Indian art, a new steam-heated swimming pool, and, of course, the spectacular ski runs.

July brings a wealth of rodeos and pioneer celebrations as rich as Oregon's western heritage. A variation on the cowboy theme is spotlighted in the Independence Day weekend Albany Timber Carnival. Daring birlers, who compete to stay on twirling logs in a millpond, and high climbers vie for world titles in skills of the industry that has been the bulwark of the Oregon economy.

The world-famous Shakespearean Festival draws crowds to the pleasant southern Oregon community of Ashland through August and early September as renowned performers display the Bard's works in authentic costumes and settings. Amid the rich wheat and cattle country of the broad eastern part of the State, real live cowboys and Indians delight small fry and oldsters alike in mid-September with one of the greatest of Wild West events, the Pendleton Roundup.

The list of festivals and celebrations, many of them sponsored or actively promoted by Aeries, runs to great length. Most of the events share a common debt, however. They are made extraordinary by, or even based solely upon, some aspect of Oregon's natural beauty. No matter how long the list of man-made spectacles, the State's awesome scenery goes the planning committee one better every time.

Numerous regattas and fishing festivals glorify the contribution of the sea to Oregon's picturesque coastal towns. No single celebration, however, can fittingly honor the magnificent 300 miles that a veteran Life photographer once told me was the most beautiful and spectacular of all the world's great seacoasts that he had ever photographed. Fortunately for Oregonians and visitors, every beach on the coast was reserved for public use by the farsighted action of Gov. Oswald West back in 1909.

It was at the northern end of this coast, near Astoria where the great and powerful Columbia River greets the sea, that Lewis and Clark spent the winter of 1805-06 after becoming the first Americans to venture overland to Oregon. The National Park Service is reconstructing their campsite as part of Fort Clatsop National Monument.

Farther down this unparalleled coast lie the vast Oregon dunes, towering billows of sand sheltering tiny clear lakes. I have recently introduced in Congress legislation to have the dunes area further preserved and developed for the public by giving national seashore status to them, and to the famed nearby Sea Lion Caves, where as many as 2,500 of the slippery animals frolic in underground caverns.

Spectacular as the coastline is, it must share honors with the mountain ranges that dominate virtually every Oregon horizon. The Skyline Trail threads along the crest of the Cascade Mountains, which soar as a north-to-south centerpiece. In northeastern Oregon, the Wallows climb ruggedly from a high plateau, forming America's own little

Switzerland around alpine meadows and lakes.

Widely traveled Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court insists that the Wallows are more beautiful than European topography to which they are so often compared.

The timbered slopes of Oregon's awesome mountain ranges drink deeply of western slope rains. As a result, many foaming streams rush to the ocean, daring anglers to capture the wealth of steelhead and trout their waters shelter. On the lower stretches of one such stream, southwestern Oregon's beautiful Rogue River, the entire family will enjoy a pleasant day's diversion, traveling from Gold Beach upriver to the little town of Agness and back in the boat that delivers mail.

Father will want to return to cast a fly in the swift Rogue's white water or troll for the big fellows on the bar at the Pacific end of the stream. All along the coast, mothers and children join fathers in surf fishing, a popular year-round, license-free sport.

In every corner of Oregon's abundant scenery—besides the smooth sands of a Pacific Beach, near a high mountain lake or next to a rushing trout stream—the visitor will find room for tents, trailers, or picnics in one of 164 well-kept State parks, more than any other State. Pleasant tourist cabins and motels are set conveniently alongside the good roads and highways.

The challenges of the great outdoors have made Oregon one of the last frontiers of America. But the pioneer spirit of the settlers who brought their belongings painfully to the new country by Conestoga wagon or Cape Horn steamer was not limited only to carving new livelihoods out of verdant forests and rich rangeland. The State has been a cradle for murderous political reform movements and leaders.

The progressive ideas in government long advocated by the Fraternal Order of Eagles find a hospitable reception in Oregon. Our State has been a leader in government reform. Oregon was the first to introduce the initiative and referendum, by which petitions may be used to place any proposal on the ballot for a plebiscite by the people. This machinery has been used to assure Oregon a high standard of old-age welfare and an educational system which ranks high in the Nation. Oregon, for example, was the first State to enact legislation providing maximum hours and minimum wages for women and children in industry.

Furthermore, Oregon led all other States in bringing about the direct election of U.S. Senators. Until Oregon elected a Senator by popular vote, Members of the Senate were appointed by the State legislature. This often encouraged corrupt deals and supremacy of special interests. After Oregon had made the breakthrough, the 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution soon followed, making mandatory the election of all Senators at the ballot box. The famed Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, said Oregon's people were entitled to the credit for this major reform.

In Oregon the Eagles have found a fertile soil for all their principal causes. The State maintains high standards of health, and Aeries have collected generously of funds for the Damon Runyon Memorial Institute for Cancer Research. Only recently the National Institutes of Health made one of the largest grants in many years—\$1,297,000 to be matched by a similar sum from the State—for a medical research center at the University of Oregon Medical School.

Jobs After 40 is also a popular undertaking in Oregon. Because the State has been a mecca for many people nearing normal retirement age, Oregon has a population sympathetic to legislation which would protect people from discrimination in employ-

ment due to their later years. The Eagles have accumulated the signatures of thousands of Oregon citizens who support the Jobs After 40 program. As a Senator from Oregon and sponsor of this proposal, I feel that I enjoy the support of most of my constituents in advancing the undertaking.

Many improved highways, supplemented by the State's own fine network of roads, will make it easier for the visitor to travel in Oregon, but the majestic scenery, which dominates all else, will continue to make it difficult for him to leave the State. Eagles who visit Oregon in this centennial year will find that out, and some of the State's Aeries may find their membership rolls fattened with transfer member when the year is over. Eagles, like other visitors, are only human.

Senator Kennedy's Remarks at United States-India Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month on May 4 and 5, the Committee for International Economic Growth sponsored a highly significant conference here in Washington on the subject of "India and the United States, 1959."

References have been made previously here in the Congress to the contributions made at the conference by a wide cross section of outstanding commentators on Indian-American relations.

Among the most eloquent and effective of the speeches delivered at the conference was one entitled "The Bases of U.S. Interest in India—Its New Dimensions" by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY's interest and concern for the future of free India has been enormously heartening to all of us who feel as he does, that India's success or failure will determine the future of freedom in Asia.

In his conference speech, Senator KENNEDY demonstrated again, as he has on many occasions in recent years, a succinct and imaginative grasp of the economic, political, and strategic role of India in Asia. I think that speech admirably reflects the kind of leadership which Senator KENNEDY is devoting to this subject, both in his legislative capacity in the U.S. Senate, and in his outside contribution to public awareness of this vital question.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of his speech as follows:

THE BASIS OF U.S. INTEREST IN INDIA—ITS NEW DIMENSIONS

(Remarks by U.S. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, Conference on India and the United States, 1959, sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth, Washington, D.C., May 4 and 5, 1959)

No struggle in the world today deserves more of our time and attention than that which now grips the attention of all Asia. I am not referring to the unhappy tide of events in Tibet, where the world is being

shown once again that man's eternal desire to be free can never be suppressed. Nor am I referring to the intermittent hostilities that endanger the Formosan Strait, or the truce lines in Korea and Indochina. I am referring to another struggle equally fierce but less obvious—less in the headlines but far more significant in the long run.

And that is the struggle between India and China for leadership of the East, for the respect of all Asia, for the opportunity to demonstrate whose way of life is the better.

The battle may be more subtle than loud—it may not even be admitted by either side—but it is a very real battle nonetheless. For it is these two countries that have the greatest magnetic attraction to the uncommitted and underdeveloped world. It is these two countries which offer a potential route of transition from economic stagnation to economic growth. India follows a route in keeping with human dignity and individual freedom, with only haphazard assistance from this country. Red China represents the route of regimented controls and ruthless denial of human rights, with considerable aid from the U.S.S.R.

It should be obvious that the outcome of this competition will vitally affect the security and standing of this Nation. But do we fully realize how it is coming out? Both China and India began their development efforts at about the same time—1950. They started with similar economic structures, similar standards of living and similar problems of skilled labor and natural resources. Actually India had some advantages—in transportation and trained personnel, for example.

But the harsh facts of the matter are that in the last decade China has surged ahead of India in most sectors of its economy. Its gross national output has expanded about three times as fast. In terms of industrial capacity, investment, education, and even household consumption China has slowly pulled up and now moved ahead. Its food production has nearly doubled, while India's has increased by less than 50 percent. By the most authoritative estimates, at present levels of agricultural growth, India will have by 1965 a food production deficit of over 25 million tons, a gap which cannot be filled by any foreign aid or domestic rationing program.

In steel production, China has moved from a position of inferiority to marked superiority. In 1950 China produced as much steel as Great Britain did in 1880. By 1958 China has moved to a point of productive superiority in steel to modern Great Britain today—and is making equal growth in coal and other major ingredients of national strength. Chou En-lai declared at the party Congress this past month: "It took us only 6 years to achieve in steel production what took Britain more than 50 years."

Since 1952 China has tripled the number of engineers and technicians in its industries and added 4 million workers to its skilled labor force.

Last year, China's rate of economic growth was at least three times as high as India's. Perhaps her official figures which claim to have doubled both agricultural and steel production may be discounted—but the fact remains that they are based on a hard record of fact compared to the sagging performance in India—and this is the record which has great appeal to those nations uncertain of which route they should follow.

Within the last year the Chinese have produced their first automobile. Within the next year they may have launched their first earth satellite. Even more seriously, they may well begin to take their place among the select company of nuclear powers. And perhaps equally significant for the future is the fact that China has become a major trading nation, not only in southeast Asia, where she is gradually supplanting Japan, but also in

the growing trade movements to Europe and Africa. Indian primary products such as manganese ore and oilseed, for example, now suffer heavily as a result of China's price competition. Red China is now able to repay its loans from the Communist bloc, while India is not only in need of considerable further assistance, but has been forced to drastically reduce its foreign exchange reserves to meet its investment gap.

For the first time in modern history a government appears to have found a way—however brutal its human defects—which appears to solve the problems of large peasant underemployment and labor surplus. The mobilization of the unemployed mass of Chinese rural workers through economic communes, cottage industry, small pig-iron schemes and all the rest is an achievement whose political and intellectual impact in less developed areas is bound to be immense.

For the ambitious goals and growth of both the Russians and the Chinese are major political influences throughout the newly awakened world. The sturdy confidence of the Red Chinese is measured against the uncertainties of the Indian Government. The Chinese leader, moreover, boasts that within the next year China will make still further leaps into the future. He promises that the total value of agricultural and industrial output will rise by as much as 40 percent in 1 year. He hopes, for example, to raise coal output by 110 million tons in 1959 alone.

Even if these hopes cannot be fulfilled, in India—by contrast—targets are wavering. Hopes are set upon maintaining a real rate of growth of only 2 to 3 percent. This year the Indian population will rise. Increased agricultural output may not even feed the nearly 8 million new mouths of India's exploding population this year. It is in this setting that we consider this challenge, not by playing down and depreciating the very real physical achievements of China, but rather by determining to match these achievements in India by a real record of performance consistent with our ideals and democratic methods.

For the struggle is not over, and the potentialities for gain in India are still great. In the Chinese language, the word "crisis" is composed of two characters, one representing danger, and one representing opportunity. The danger now is clear. But let us also make the most of our opportunities. For if they are lost now, they may never come again.

India's population represents 40 percent of the uncommitted world. It is larger than the total populations of the continents of Africa and South America combined. Unless India is able to demonstrate an ability at least equal to that of China to make the transition from economic stagnation to growth, so that it can get ahead of its exploding population, the entire free world will suffer a serious reverse. India herself will be gripped by frustration and political instability, its role as a counter to the Red Chinese will be lost, and communism would have won its greatest bloodless victory.

So let there be no mistake about the nature of the crisis—both the danger and the opportunity. And let there be no mistake about the urgency of our participation in this struggle. It is not enough that we participate on a crash basis, for temporary relief. We must be willing to join with other Western nations in a serious long-range program of long-term loans, backed up by technical and agricultural assistance, designed to enable India to overtake the challenge of Communist China. The tool for this program can well be the Development Loan Fund.

I have joined with Senator FULBRIGHT in proposing that the operations of the Development Loan Fund be stabilized and its scale increased by placing it on a 5-year basis with authority to loan up to \$1.5 billion a year. If by next year we can build

up the resources of the Development Loan Fund to this level with assurance of continuity, then the United States will be in a position to exercise real leverage on the economic growth of the less developed countries and to give international leadership in the common efforts of the free world. We should embark on these reforms not at some indeterminate date in the future, but this year when there are real opportunities to seize.

Our assistance thus far has been limited to emergency aid to meet immediate crises and existing shortages. We have not met the requirements essential for long-range economic growth—nor have we alleviated the harsh realities which India faced a year ago. Her population continues nearly to outpace her economic development, her shortage of foreign exchange continues to increase, and a general loss of hope and morale continues to spread.

This is the critical year for India. This is the year when the second 5-year plan will prove to be either fruitful or futile. This is also the year when the third plan beginning in 1961 will be designed. This is the year, in short, when India must appraise her future and her relations with the rest of the world.

I do not say that India could not tread water for a few more years before going under. But this is the year the Indians need confidence that they can plan major efforts for long-range progress with some assurance of substantial, long-term assistance from the Western World.

Our aid should, of course, be based upon sound criteria and productive investment. But let us remember economies need time to mature. Our own Nation, in the days of its youth, sold railroad bonds to the British and other Europeans—and these were long-term—40- or 50-year—debentures. With the growth of our productive capacity, we gradually became a creditor nation with the ability to repay these foreign investments. There is no question that the Indians, given proper assurance and assistance, could do the same.

Many of the other governments in Asia and the Middle East are now balanced precariously on the wall of indecision between the East and West. Of course, an adequate program of aid to India is no magic persuader—nor is it a panacea for all of India's difficulties. There is no such solution for these tough problems. The barriers are great. The political and ideological dilemmas are many.

But I am confident that we can recover the initiative, that we can give a doubting world the realization that we—and not Russia and China—can help them achieve real stability and growth.

In short, it is our job to prove that we can devote as much energy, intelligence, idealism, and sacrifice to the survival and triumph of the open society as the Russian despots can extort by compulsion in defense of their closed system of tyranny. We can give a convincing demonstration that we have not a propaganda or crisis interest but an enduring long-term interest in the productive economic growth of the less developed nations.

This year, all over the Western World—and particularly in an impressive Washington ceremony last month—we commemorate a notable anniversary, the founding of NATO. Whatever its handicaps may be today, this unique and historic association of free nations in a community of effort demonstrated that alliances can prosper on positive, as well as negative, goals.

Let us bear that decision in mind today. For, just as in 1949 the historic front was in West Europe, so in 1959 the gateway to fresh achievement lies in Asia. As Russia cast her ominous shadow across the horizon of our hopes during the last decade, so in the next

decade we must take measure of a new power—China, whose mounting strength is the cardinal political development of this area.

How will we meet the challenge of the next 10 years, between now and 1969? Will we be reminded of a lost journey which ended with the fall of Prague in the spring of 1939, or the new vitality of the democratic alliance which was formed in the spring of 1949?

The answer lies in part in congressional action, along the lines I have indicated, on the Development Loan Fund, our best tool for aiding long-range capital development. But the job should not and cannot be done by the United States alone. We need—as we needed 10 years ago—another historic effort in international collaboration—among the capital exporting nations in the world and India herself.

That is why Senator COOPER and I have recommended the creation of an international joint mission to India to work out with the Indians an accurate appraisal of their needs over the life of the third plan, to weave together the various aid programs of the Western nations, and to give both assurance and incentive not only to the Indians but to democratic leaders throughout the underdeveloped world, to demonstrate to them, and to enable them to demonstrate to their political followers, that there is a democratic way of achieving economic development as an alternative to the forced mobilization of men and materials. Once again, the free world can unite on a positive program with positive goals—instead of hanging together only out of fear of evils which we all oppose.

Coalitions of free states impose strains and sometimes handicaps, particularly in a period of peace and apathy. The allies of the U.S.S.R. and China, on the other hand, are rarely critical or uncooperative. They are at the very least silently, if grudgingly, submissive. But in a time of crisis, a free alliance finds unity and strength, even in the free exchange of ideas—while the Red satellites in a time of crisis are sources of anxiety, uncertainty, and trouble.

The situation in India is today a crisis, and it is an opportunity to demonstrate Western unity and strength. The moment is ripe for giving new meaning to the Atlantic Community and relating its peaceful enterprises to the aspirations of the uncommitted world. If the President and Congress give new momentum to our foreign assistance program, then we can expect with reason that the nations of the Common Market and the Commonwealth will also give realization to a larger effort of their own. Both the Secretary-General of NATO, Mr. Spaak, and the world spokesman of the Common Market, Mr. Monnet, have underscored in recent months that the great issues facing the member nations lie outside Europe and preeminently in the underdeveloped areas.

The creditor states of Europe are deeply involved in India's future, as are Japan and other potential members of this common enterprise. Our task now is to harness all of the resources of these nations more effectively, and to work out with the Indian Government the most effective method in participating in their developmental plans.

If the aid which India has received from all sources should remain at its current level, the increase in national income would barely outstrip population growth, bring no significant decreases in unemployment, increase the alarming deficit of food grains, and require sharp curbs on private enterprise in that economy.

If, however, foreign investment in India from all sources can rise to a figure of about \$1 billion a year, then we can foresee with some confidence a growth in Indian income in the range of 25 to 30 percent as against a 10 to 12 percent growth in population. Unemployment might be reduced. Provided

India takes vigorous measures of agricultural reform, food supply might finally outpace the increase of population, and the private sector of the economy would again reflect the dynamism which it exhibited at the end of the first plan.

But it is not enough merely to provide sufficient money. Equally important is our attitude and our understanding. For if we undertake this effort in the wrong spirit, or for the wrong reasons, or in the wrong way, then any and all financial measures will be in vain.

I have spoken here today about India's race with Red China. We want India to win that race. We want India to be a free and thriving leader of a free and thriving Asia. But if our interest appears to be purely selfish, anti-Communist and part of the cold war, if it appears to the Indian people that our motives are purely political, then we shall play into the hands of Communist and neutralist propagandists, cruelly distort America's image abroad, and undo much of the psychological effect that we expect from our generosity.

We ought to return to the generous spirit in which the original point 4 program was conceived; stress our positive interest in, and moral responsibility for, relieving misery and poverty; and acknowledge to ourselves and the world that, communism or no communism, we cannot be an island unto ourselves. That alone would do justice to the innately decent motives from which most Americans do support foreign aid.

There is considerable talk these days in Washington about distinguishing between military and economic assistance, and emphasizing the latter. I join in that endeavor, and consider it of major importance to the success of this program. But there are other distinctions which must be made—distinctions which are important to public understanding of the issues—and important to the self-respect and sensitivity of recipient nations.

Let us distinguish between lending a helping hand to countries—such as India—which are carrying forward their own development and, on the other hand, underwriting the entire economies of such vital but shaky areas as South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam. In one case, we are providing the all-important missing link in a total development effort, but in the other, capital development is only an incidental part of overall budget support.

Secondly, let us distinguish between aid shipments that are geared to the needs of the recipient countries, and those which are more geared to our domestic needs to dispose of agricultural surpluses. Certainly food shipments for famined relief in India and Pakistan are worth while, but where foreign needs and domestic embarrassments do not happen to coincide so nicely, we should not subordinate needs of the recipient country to our domestic political conveniences.

Finally, let us distinguish between foreign aid needed to prop up a faltering friend and aid which is part of a comprehensive, long-range foreign economic policy.

Foreign aid is important to most underdeveloped countries; but for some of them the real life-and-death question is markets for their export commodities; compared to that foreign aid receipts are often desirable incidentals. Many underdeveloped countries, if they had to choose between foreign aid and stable markets, would choose the latter.

The one-commodity nations, such as Bolivia and Ghana, are particularly affected by our business conditions and market policies, but even nations such as India are concerned about the economic cycle in this Nation, about our plans for commodity stabilization, and about our hopes for reciprocal trade agreements with more predictable tariff procedures.

All of this, by way of attitude and action, can be done, and must be done.

The free world cannot shame Russia and China into freedom, but it can inspire democracy to enrich its own freedoms. Freedom's banner will be vindicated or lost not by the test of military strength alone, but by the purity and passion of our commitment to democracy, by our dedication to the advancing hopes of new nations, and by our determination to provide that freedom can lift the haggard burden of poverty from desolate lands. We have not yet conquered the frontiers of fear. But neither have we yet fully explored the horizons of hope.

Slogan and Slowdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in mid-April the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] addressed a Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in the tri-city area of Pasco, Kennewick, and Richland, Wash.

Favorable reaction is still reaching my office from the searching and penetrating analysis given regional, national, and international issues in his address.

I request unanimous consent that Senator HUMPHREY's address of April 20 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY FOR ABUNDANCE—REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC DINNER MEETING, TRI-CITY AREA, WASHINGTON, APRIL 20

Here in this tri-city area you not only stand at the confluence of two great rivers, the Snake and the Columbia, but also at the crossroads of two great historical achievements in man's quest for energy.

Here you receive the benefits of electric energy created by falling water from the multipurpose Grand Coulee Dam on the great Columbia River.

And here you are helping to bring about the most phenomenal of the long line of achievements in the power field—the development of electricity created by atomic power.

One of our greatest needs in America today is energy and more energy—energy to fulfill the infinite needs of man and his environment—energy for abundance.

Why do we need so much power?

We need an ever-increasing supply of power just to maintain our present standard of living. We need it to keep pace with a rapid increase in population—a population which will reach some 260 millions by 1980.

We need an ever-increasing supply of power to support our Defense Establishment.

We need power to remove poverty here at home and increase economic opportunity for all.

We need power to extend a helpful hand to less fortunate neighbors abroad.

We need power to serve as a living example of what free men can do with science and industry.

Whether ultimately we take the road of fission via hydrogen or fusion via nuclear fuels; whether we get our usable electricity

by utilizing heat and turbines for electricity; or whether we achieve direct conversion of heat into electricity without the expense and waste inherent in the use of steam, we still must achieve an abundance of energy which should, in time, make all men free from the grueling toil of our ancestors, the malnutrition and famine of our contemporaries.

Power is our first line of defense in the cold war.

When I look at the amazing growth in Soviet generating capacity, my biggest concern is that we keep ahead in the kilowatt race—far ahead.

Between 1945—the last year of World War II—and 1958 the total generating capacity in the United States more than doubled. Our total output of electricity almost tripled. This is good, but not good enough.

The generating capacity of the U.S.S.R. jumped from 10.7 million kilowatts in 1945 to 48.3 million in 1957—more than a fourfold increase. Output there rose from 43.3 billion kilowatt-hours to 210 billion—almost fivefold. According to Allen Dulles of the CIA, their output by 1965 will rise to 460 billion kilowatt-hours—more than double in about 8 years—more than 10 times as much as 20 years earlier. In the cold war and the threatened competition in the economic field it is slight comfort to be assured that in 1965 our capacity will still be more than twice that of Russia—when we have quadrupled our capacity while they have multiplied theirs by 10.

I do not take the doctrinaire position that all the electrical energy we need should be public power, or private power. The problem is not that our sources of energy be in private or public hands, but that there be enough of it at economical rates.

I do not want to be misunderstood. In the drive for abundant supplies of low-cost energy there is—there must be—a place for Federal development, for the Federal yardstick in both hydro and atomic power. There is a place for State and local public power systems where the people want them. There is and should be a big place for private enterprise, regulated as a monopoly and stimulated by public competition.

I am not the imaginary "whole hog" strawman at which Mr. Eisenhower shoots somewhat more than imaginary darts in the form of scare words. But I have no doubts whatsoever as to the benefits which would be lost should private monopoly in the power industry be freed from competition by public and cooperative electric systems.

I have no reservations whatsoever about the continued desirability of construction of public generation and transmission facilities and the marketing of Federal power under the preference clause. I say to my friends in the private utility industry: In an economy of abundance, particularly here in the Northwest with your tremendous power potential, if Federal development went forward as rapidly as it should, there would be an abundance of low-cost power for all—from the smallest little cooperative to the largest private power company.

In this country, since 1953, we have been living under the influence of an administration hypnotized by its own sloganmakers. You are all familiar with the expensive slogans of recent years: "Get the Government out of the power business." "Unleash private enterprise to develop the Nation's rivers at no expense to the taxpayers." "Partnership." "Abolish the Federal monopoly on atomic energy and let American private enterprise do the job." "Reduce expenditures." "Reduce taxes." "Enlarge loopholes for the great corporations through accelerated depreciation." "Balance the budget at whatever cost."

Here in the Northwest you have seen the fruits of this policy of slogan and slowdown.

In spite of everything we could do, the Idaho Power Co. has acquired the great

Hells Canyon site at an immense cost to the Northwest in terms of flood control, low-cost power, phosphate development, industrial growth, and all of the benefits which would have flowed from that great project.

You have witnessed years of inaction in the authorization of vitally needed projects.

You have witnessed the appointment to the International Boundary Commission of men like Doug McKay—men who speak the same language as the interests that have jeopardized the longstanding international cooperation between the United States and Canada on the full development of the Columbia.

You have been acutely aware of the way in which Federal budget recommendations for power and river development have dropped almost from sight.

The Pacific Northwest has 40 percent of the potential hydropower in the United States and only about a quarter of this has been developed. There is nothing more essential to the well-being of this Nation—yes, and to its security—than that we get on with the task of pushing this development to completion.

You, we, the entire Nation have already lost the equivalent of one Bonneville Dam at Hells Canyon. This is a luxury we can ill afford—even though the Congress was able to force the administration and the Idaho Power Co. to disgorge the \$365 million subsidy which the administration had granted to that company after it had pledged it would develop the middle Snake without a cent of the taxpayers' money.

It is time that we got about the business of harnessing the hydropower of the Northwest, increasing the irrigated lands to meet the needs of our growing population, controlling the destructive floods which threaten our lands, industry, commerce, and people.

If the psychology and slogans of the Eisenhower administration had been official policy in the old days, the Lewis and Clark Expedition would have been grounded in St. Louis for lack of funds; the Oregon Trail would have been closed to balance the budget; and the settling of the Northwest would have been postponed indefinitely as a threat to a stable dollar.

In 1954 the administration launched an all-out drive to give away the richest discovery in the history of man. That was the atomic energy program for which the Congress up to that time had voted something like \$13 billion.

In Congress, because of the great leadership of your own Senators WARREN MAGNUSON and HENRY JACKSON, we were able to water down the giveaway. We were able to assert a preference right for nonprofit systems; we were able to write in an amendment permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to force the cross-licensing of patents.

But under our form of government, with its division of powers, the Congress—even when the Democrats have a majority—cannot govern the country. And the results of the great battle over the atomic energy program have not been heartening.

Year after year the Democrats in Congress have fought to get the money and Executive support necessary to carry out a crash program on atomic energy. We have been met with a numbers game on what was being accomplished, or planned, or dreamed, or hoped for, ad infinitum. So that today we are lagging behind England and the Soviet Union in the development of atomic energy.

Last year under the leadership of your Senator JACKSON and Senator MORSE of Oregon, we authorized a dual-purpose reactor for Hanford, to produce both plutonium and electricity—700,000 kilowatts of electricity—two Bonneilles. But the pressures against

this reactor never cease. All we have so far is an installation under construction which can be made dual purpose, but the fight for the power part of the installation is still ahead of us.

There is still another battle we must somehow win. Senator JACKSON and those of us who support him have insisted that power from the Hanford reactor be fed into the Bonneville power grid where it can be utilized to its maximum to supply all of the people with low-cost power. But the Republican administration cannot see this proposal. Their vision stops at private utility stock market quotations.

The Republican administration is blind to the benefits of a giant power grid, which can tie together the generating facilities of an entire region.

The productive power of a modern industrial society is closely related to the cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity. And the economical production and transmission of electricity is inextricably tied to a "giant power" grid, envisioned a generation ago by Gov. Gifford Pinchot. In the Northwest the Bonneville power grid has given you the closest thing in the Nation, with the possible exception of the TVA area, to giant power. But we must build a power grid for the whole Nation which will enable us to tie giant atomic reactors to hydro and steam facilities so that the entire Nation may have the benefits of an abundance of low-cost power, supplied by public and private sources alike.

Taken as a whole, our power system is too much like our highway system 40 years ago. Some of you can remember the days when our highway system was largely a county and city affair. Even the paved roads—and there weren't many of them—looked like something kids in the first grade had drawn for fun. They were a few feet wide; they climbed any hill a team and wagon could climb; they zig-zagged around each farm or other obstruction, real or political. Adequate for a team and wagon, they were a challenge to even the model T and a positive threat to the occasional foolhardy spirit who wanted to push a White Steamer down them at 20 miles per hour.

We just could not have gotten very far into the 20th century with that kind of a highway system. So we did something about it.

But today the Nation's power grid is planned about as scientifically and with just about as much regard for the Nation's requirements as the counties planned highways 40 years ago. Part of the trouble—then and now—was inability of the local units to finance anything better. Part of the trouble—then and now—was an inability to conceive of anything that couldn't be seen from the window of a courthouse.

Our technicians can build a real power grid, and we can afford that kind of a power grid. We ought to have it. And we ought to have it soon.

Five hundred thousand kilovolt transmission lines which are only in the talking stage here are already in operation in Russia. The Russians are planning million-kilovolt lines with direct current transmission over which they can transport power 1,000 miles with only limited loss of energy. These lines will enable them to link giant hydro to giant thermal generators with the latter (if coal fired) built near coal mines. The economies of "hauling coal by wire" will be of great significance in achieving low-cost power.

In this great land peopled by "strangers from a thousand shores," we have moved mankind far in three centuries, blessed by immense natural resources and the greatest individual freedom of any industrial people in the history of the world.

Have we grown weary? Or old? Or afraid?

Are we prepared to lay down our burdens and give up our hopes and fall prey to our fears and distrust of each other?

I say "no," and I believe the overwhelming majority of our people say "no." Let us go forward, contending as we may over our honest differences and over our various vested interests, but let us have an end to fears and the slogans of stagnation and sterility. The highest wisdom, it has been said, is to dare. I believe this and I believe you do, too.

Judge Murtagh's Book on Drug Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of drug addiction remains a constant menace for our youth. Parents, teachers, welfare workers, civic leaders, and certainly legislators, have given much thought to this problem and possible ways for its solution. In March of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 5304, to establish a Customs Enforcement Division in the Bureau of Customs to provide stricter enforcement of the anti-smuggling laws and thus put a stop to the smuggling of narcotics into this country. This would be a great help toward a solution.

The problem of solving drug addiction in the country and the treatment of drug addicts is, of course, a matter which should be solved primarily by our welfare workers, the courts, the enforcement agencies, and others who come in direct contact with the addicts and are thoroughly familiar with their problem.

A very interesting book on the subject has just been published, and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues, as well as to members of the judiciary, welfare workers, and others interested in the subject. The name of the book is "Who Live in Shadow," and its authors are Judge John M. Murtagh and Sara Harris. Some time ago they also coauthored a book "Cast the First Stone," which was an exposé of prostitution and the police approach to the problem.

Judge Murtagh is chief magistrate of the New York City Magistrates' Court. I have had the privilege of serving with him before entering Congress when I was a city magistrate in Brooklyn. He is an eminent jurist and a man who does not hesitate to express his views frankly and openly. These views are based in large measure on cases that have come before him or that he encountered in the course of his work on the bench.

"Who Lives in Shadow" is an exposé of another festering sore in American social life, drug addiction. Characterized as an inside view of the phantasmal world of "Narcotics, USA," its victims, racketeers, and police officers, the book uses vivid case histories of users and pushers of all ages and walks of life; and authentic, shocking information on the pathetically futile attempts to hunt dope smugglers and cure the addict. It is an angry, compellingly readable work of no-holds-barred dramatic journalism.

Stiff fines and long jail sentences are not the answer, the authors claim. They only make the unfortunate addict feel more like a criminal. Instead, the authors suggest that clinics be set up to provide hopeless users with enough drugs to keep them from turning to crime and degradation. Take the profit out of dope, they argue, and smuggling will be cut down to almost nothing.

"A punitive, prohibitory approach to the drug problem," the authors say, "has been the official policy of the United States for 40 years. No other country in the world has been so sadistic in dealing with addicts. Still there are more addicts in the United States today than in all Western countries combined, and more juvenile users in New York City than in all Europe."

The authors maintain further that the prohibitory approach as utilized by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics is in direct conflict with the law as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States. "There is nothing in the Harrison Act under which addicts are prosecuted," they say, "which precludes doctors from treating for addiction." Yet the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has, over the years, engaged in a reign of terror among physicians so that they have become intimidated and stopped treating addicts. Lawyers may interpret to doctors, as many of them do, the illegality of the Narcotics Bureau's position. But doctors can hardly be expected to rely on such opinions and to challenge the Narcotics Bureau. They would place in jeopardy their licenses to practice medicine. They would expose themselves to the risk of temporary detention or even prolonged incarceration. And even though ultimately successful, they would meanwhile have incurred the cost and experienced the harassment, humiliation and embarrassment inherent in criminal litigation.

"And so, despite the pronouncements of the Supreme Court, the law of the land tends to be obscured by bureaucratic policy that is contrary to law, and the medical practitioner is effectively prevented from caring for addicts. Addicts must therefore seek their succor from the underworld instead of from legitimate society. And, of course, the price that the underworld exacts from them is so high that they are practically mandated to become criminals. How, except through criminal activity, can people with \$30, \$40, \$50 a day habits and no particular wealth or talent raise the money they need? And when they do what they are driven to, we prosecute them for their illness."

"The fact is," the authors say, "that addicts and petty pushers are practically the only ones being prosecuted today." The big moguls of the trade, who control importation and distribution, are neither caught nor stopped. In a way they must be grateful for the Government's single-minded attitude toward addiction. Our drug laws are immoral in principle and ineffectual in operation.

Calling for the Government to unshackle the medical profession, the authors cite the success of this approach in England. There they state that "there

are less than 400 known drug addicts. In England, however, the words criminal addict are never heard. And doctors are allowed to dispense drugs to users and to treat them either in their own offices or in clinics."

But the authors add that due to our policy we must now go beyond mere permissiveness toward the medical profession and evolve more aggressive methods for coping with this illness.

Narcotic hospital facilities under Federal auspices should be established in all large cities. These would institutionalize addicts for a period of at least 2 months, during which time they would be withdrawn from narcotics and exposed to a rehabilitative program, including contact with doctors, psychiatrists, social workers, vocational and recreational guidance personnel, and so forth.

After their release from the hospital, addicts would become outpatients in the clinical attachment of their hospitals. Efforts at rehabilitation would be continued, with the addicts receiving medical, psychiatric and social service. Those whose hospital withdrawal were successful would be treated without drugs; those who reverted after leaving the hospital and were proved to be in need of drugs, would get at cost the amounts their doctors prescribed for them. Gradual withdrawal would be reattempted with them when their psychiatrists judged the supportive therapy to have taken sufficient hold so that they could rely on it instead of the drug. Those who were considered "incurable" by the clinic professionals would be released from therapy while still receiving indicated dosages of their drug.

Aid to Tito: Proof That We Have No Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD my remarks on the subject of "Aid to Tito: Proof That We Have No Foreign Policy":

In our foreign aid program there are admittedly cases where it is not easy to determine whether or not it is in our best interest to give aid, and if aid is to be given, to what extent and under what conditions. But there are cases where it is absolutely beyond any doubt that the aid given is not benefiting the United States, but is being used against us. At the top of this list is the case of aid to the Yugoslav Communist dictator, Tito.

The plain and incontrovertible facts of the Tito case are these:

First. That he never was, nor did he ever pretend to be anything else but a Communist, dedicated to the victory

of Communist imperialism in the world.

Second. That, according to his own admission, his foreign policy has never changed, but remains the same before and after his break with Stalin—June 28, 1948.

Third. That before that so-called break, during the break and after the reconciliation with Moscow—June 1955—Communist Yugoslavia constantly and unchangeably voted in all questions of any substance with the Russian Communist bloc, against the United States.

Fourth. That the internal regime of Communist Yugoslavia has remained the same, and was not in the least affected in any democratic sense by the huge aid which Tito has received from the United States.

Fifth. That only recently Yugoslavia nationalized—i.e., confiscated—all real estate in Yugoslavia with the explanation that Communist Yugoslavia's road was clear and it clearly led to communism. Therefore, private property had to disappear.

Sixth. That Tito repeatedly declared that he was using all the aid from the capitalistic West to build socialism—communism—in Yugoslavia.

Seventh. That Tito time and again declared that there was not and could never be any democracy or freedom for the enemies of communism in Yugoslavia.

Beyond all this, Tito has played and is playing an exceptionally important part in the Communist conquest of Asia. In November 1957 Vice President Nixon called public attention to the decisive role which Asia will play in the final outcome of the contest between human freedom and communism in the world. He then said that if the Communists succeed in winning control over Asia and the Middle East, they will win. Unfortunately, we are not far from that critical point and the man who played the key role in the conquest of the minds of the Asian people for communism is Tito.

How is it possible, in view of this record, that there are still people to tell us that it is in the interests of the United States to help the ruthless tyrant of Yugoslavia and that such is still the foreign policy of the greatest democracy in the world? Let us briefly examine the arguments of the adherents of our aid-to-Tito policy. They can, briefly, be summarized as follows:

First. That Tito is a Communist, but different and independent from Moscow.

Second. That Tito is, moreover, waging political warfare against the Russian Communists and Red Chinese.

Third. That he will, in case of war, be neutral or may fight on our side and, finally,

Fourth. That the people in Yugoslavia have accepted the regime and have reconciled themselves to living under communism.

In reality, all these assertions of Tito's propaganda, skillfully served to gullible Westerners by Communist agents in the free world, have no basis whatsoever in facts.

The fairy tale of Tito's independence was concocted by Yugoslav Communist propaganda and further spread by those who wish to help Tito, not to help the United States. From the first opportunity—Danube Conference in August 1948—after the Stalin-Tito rift until the present, Communist Yugoslavia has adopted the same attitude as the U.S.S.R. on all issues with which world communism is vitally concerned. What kind of independence is it that implies no important differences, but complete identity and conformity with the Russian plan for world conquest? At the VII Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia—April 1958—the Yugoslav Vice Premier, Edward Kardelj, summed up his explanations about Yugoslav foreign policy by saying that "it can be understood only if one bears in mind that Yugoslavia is a Communist country and that its fate depends on the fate of communism in the world."

As for the dissension and feuds between Tito and Moscow and Peiping, they are not completely faked, which means that they are not just staged for the sake of fooling the West. They differ on nonessentials but they all agree on the plan for communism to dominate the world. But, on the other hand, the importance and consequences of those battles of words are no mystery, since Tito and others have often spoken about them and precisely defined their nature. The most outspoken was Edward Kardelj, the chief theoretician of the Yugoslav Communist regime, who said, May 5, 1959, that the differences between Yugoslav Communists and other Communists were "only the expression of the contradictions which are proper to the whole socialist development, that is which do not represent any national specific trait of Yugoslavia." He also laid full emphasis on the fact that the differences were not due to any nationalism on the part of any Communist, nor on any difference of dogma. Finally, he stressed that the Yugoslav Communists were "consistent not only in the building of socialism—Communist—but in the defense of the principle of Socialist—Communist—solidarity."

In the light of these facts and Tito's solemn statement in Stalingrad—June 1956—that Yugoslavia would march shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union in peace and in war, there is no need to refute the willful and vile contention of Yugoslavia's neutrality in case of a war. The full cooperation between the Yugoslav submarine base in Boka Kotorska and the Russian submarine base in Sasseno—Albania—as well as the Russian-Yugoslav identity of opinions on the creation of the Khrushchev-sponsored zone of peace in the Balkans and the Mediterranean must be explained out of existence before any responsible Western statesman would dare to hope that Yugoslavia would stand in our camp in case of war. Incidentally, there are recent reports that the Russians are building in Kocivje, in northwestern Yugoslavia, a long-range missile launching site. It would certainly pay to investigate this news before giving a single dollar to the Communist oppressor

of 18 million human beings in Yugoslavia.

Finally, the claim of the pro-Tito clique among our American opinion makers, that Tito's communism is different and more democratic and thus made acceptable to the people of Yugoslavia, is shattered by the findings of the Zellerbach Commission on Refugees, which issued recently a comprehensive and carefully documented report on the problem of refugees in Europe. In this report the Zellerbach Commission stated that Yugoslavia is the main refugee producing country in Europe. In the last 2 years nearly 40,000 people have escaped from the democracy of Communist Tito.

In view of all these fundamental and irrefutable facts, the policy of aid to Tito is absolutely indefensible. There is not one reason for continuing that policy and there is every reason for immediately putting an end to it. Our present policy of aid to Communist Tito is a policy of national suicide. Khrushchev warned us a year ago in a public statement that the Communists would bury us. By helping Communist Yugoslavia we are hastening the process of our own destruction, helping the spread of communism in the world and thus digging the graves for ourselves, for our children, and for our children's children.

Foreign Trade and Aid: Profit or Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the May 11, 1959, issue of the report—American Investments Abroad—gave a few details on governmental policies which are undermining America's strength in the world, policies which are sold to the public as necessary to build our strength.

Policies of the Federal Government have saddled American industry and workers with so much redtape and expense that other nations have begun to equal us in productivity. Many American industries are closing their American operations and building plants overseas, thus creating employment and greater productivity abroad. Governmental policies are making Americans dependent on foreign factories for some goods which America once produced in greater quantity than all other nations combined. Foreign aid programs, taxing American industries to build rival industries abroad. Even the Soviets have begun to capture some of free-enterprise America's foreign markets.

Governmental programs which encourage or force American business to invest and build abroad instead of in America, coupled with foreign aid which reduces production costs in foreign nations while increasing them in America, have caused a dangerous flight of our gold reserves to foreign countries—and the depreciation of American currency throughout the world.

Yet, in 1959, the two programs which the administration exerts the most effort for are the two which will make matters worse: (1) Continuation of foreign aid and (2) special tax and other benefits for Americans who pull up stakes in America and invest abroad.

On May 3, 1959, the New York Times devoted an entire section to the World Trade Fair to be held at the Coliseum in New York, beginning May 8. The Times said:

Manufacturers and producers of raw materials in North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa will compete for a share of the world's wealthiest market, the United States.

The amount of (textile) goods coming into America from abroad seems to be increasing, chiefly because countries that previously did not ship here are stepping up their exports.

In 1958, total imports of cotton goods amounted to 143,290,000 square yards, an increase of 16 percent, compared with 1957. And this year there is a rising trend of imports from Hong Kong and Korea.

Both India and Pakistan have received orders from importers here for substantial quantities of sheetings and drills at prices somewhat below those quoted by American manufacturers.

Japan is still by far the largest exporter of cotton goods to the United States. In fabrics alone, the Japanese exports here in 1958 totaling 105,220,000 yards comprised 70 percent of all imports. In addition it is estimated that Japan shipped an additional 130 million yards of cottons in the form of shirts, dresses, and other apparel items.

This year, imports from Japan are expected to be even larger. Japan has negotiated successfully for an increase in its voluntary quota of cottons shipped to the United States.

The Japanese have contended that the previous 235 million yard quota in the form of fabrics and apparel is not "realistic" in the light of its growing industry and reciprocal purchases of raw materials.

Last week, it was announced that the quota had been increased, with the consent of the State Department, to about 247 million yards.

One reason for the remarkable growth of the Japanese textile industry is American foreign aid, building in Japan, at American taxpayers' expense, great plants with modern equipment, superior to what American manufacturers can afford, after paying taxes to help finance fine plants for their Japanese competitors. Another reason is the lower labor costs and taxes in Japan.

The phrase about Japan's "reciprocal purchases of raw materials" is a deception. It implies that, whereas Japan may be capturing our domestic market for finished goods, she is a good customer for our raw materials. What raw materials? Cotton. Japan is using American cotton, because our Government—under the agricultural surplus disposal program—is making American cotton available to Japanese manufacturers at prices lower than American manufacturers have to pay for the same cotton. In fact, our Government sells American cotton to Japan—for Japanese currency, which we spend in Japan to stimulate the Japanese economy—for less than what the cotton actually costs the American taxpayers who—under the Government's domestic farm programs—must buy the cotton from American farmers and put it in storage, or dispose of it abroad, in order to keep cotton prices high in America.

But the American State Department approves of an arrangement to import even more Japanese goods, because this arrangement is more "realistic" for Japan.

It seems quite impossible for American officialdom to consider, ever, what is realistic for America.

A U.S. Senate subcommittee which studied the problems of the American textile industry—under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE—found that the textile industry is suffering from foreign competition, but said it does not want to change the Government's foreign trade policy.

The Senate subcommittee said:

We do not suggest that our foreign trade policy has been the only cause of the loss of textile jobs, but we do point out that an industry faced with declining job opportunities feels the impact of rising imports more than an industry which is expanding its output and employment.

Thus we recommend that in the administration of our foreign trade program, every effort be made to channel imports into those markets which can most easily absorb production from abroad.

As a guide to positive action, these remarks from PASTORE's committee are, obviously, meaningless. But the attitude they reflect is clear, and significant. What they say, in effect, is: "Let's try to switch some of the unfair foreign competition—unfair, because it is subsidized by American taxpayers—to other American industries, as a possible means of giving the American textile industry a breather, but leave us not change Government policies which are undermining the whole American economy."

This is the personal political weakness that has caused the present condition. New people in public life who are afraid of what someone calls public opinion.

The real public opinion is that of the displaced American worker, his family, his creditors, and soon his local merchants who will have shelves full of foreign goods and streets full of American unemployed.

There is information on other American industries which are in trouble too. The New York Times said:

American makers of transistor portable radio sets may import Japanese receivers for the first time this year, and sell them here under well-known domestic brand names.

The move would be an application of the old saw: "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em." Domestic producers have watched their share of the market dwindle alarmingly and * * * Japanese portables climb more than 200 percent in the last 2 years.

Another Japanese threat to American producers in the near future lies in truly portable television sets.

Although portable radios are the only imported products that are actually nosing American electronic home instrument producers out of their own market so far, the West Germans and Japanese are penetrating here with other devices.

Imports are cutting a wide swath in the U.S. market in home furnishings. Domestic carpet producers are becoming increasingly worried about the rising sales here of carpets from Belgium. American mills also are uneasy about the success of carpets made in Japan.

Dinnerware continues to be a thorn in the side of domestic producers, as Japanese, West German, French, and other foreign makers

of dishes, cups, and saucers maintain or increase their already substantial share in the market.

On May 1, 1959, Henry J. Heinz II, U.S. delegate to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, meeting at Geneva, told the U.N. Commission that U.S. exports of goods and services to Western Europe totaled \$6,800 million in 1958, a decline of \$1,200 million from 1957; and that U.S. imports from Western Europe totaled \$7,200 million in 1958, an increase of \$300 million over 1957.

Mr. Heinz said:

American consumers are tending to spend an increasing portion of their income on those types of goods which European producers are especially well fitted to supply.

This overall trade development—declining production in America, increasing production in Europe—is, Mr. Heinz told the U.N. gathering, "warmly welcome" to the American Government.

What goods are European producers "especially well fitted to supply" the American market, and why are they well fitted?

A survey published in the June 1, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report provides some answers. Here are excerpts from the survey:

The United States through purchases abroad, has made available \$190 billion in postwar years. Add that sum to the \$107.9 billion in gifts and loans and private investments, and the total becomes \$297.9 billion.

What has the outside world done with its \$297.9 billion? Those dollars have rebuilt industries and cities. They have been used to purchase the latest in American machinery and to acquire the highest skills with which to make industry abroad fully competitive with American industry. At the same time, nations receiving the billions have used \$11 billion to add to their financial reserves in gold and dollars.

This country today finds itself challenged by those it helped.

The American dollar, once a proud currency—the strongest in the world—now is selling at a discount in terms of some foreign currencies. Rumors in the financial centers of Europe are that the dollar may have to be revalued—depreciated in relation to gold. The dollar scarcity that alarmed planners not many years ago has been turned by U.S. generosity into a superabundance of dollars in Europe.

Gold is flowing away from the United States as some countries turn their immense reserves of dollars into gold. Foreigners at this time hold claims to \$12.7 billion of the 20.3 billions of gold in the U.S. stockpile. If these foreigners ever exercise those claims, this country could find itself in a severe financial squeeze applied by those who enjoyed so much U.S. generosity.

Goods from abroad are coming into the United States to capture more and more markets. The industry that United States spent billions to revive and that U.S. industry helped to teach efficient mass production is able now to undersell its teachers in a growing number of fields.

In 1958, the industry of West Europe, prostrate 10 years earlier, produced more steel than the United States produced. As many trucks are being produced in Europe as here. Europe's industry last year built 1.9 million new dwellings, or far more than United States. Japan today is producing at double the prewar rate, thanks in part to American aid.

The industry abroad, that American aid did so much to revive, often is able now to undersell the products of American industry both in this country and outside. Many

nations receiving aid from the United States are keeping up their barriers against American products.

So enticing is the prosperity of the world outside the United States that American investors are sending more than \$3 billion of private capital abroad each year for investment. A growing number of American companies are entering the foreign field, often to produce goods not only for markets abroad but for sale back in the United States.

All of this is part of the story of success that has grown from American generosity in postwar years. That generosity, in fact, has been so great that it accounts, in part, for the inflation within United States that is making it more difficult for this country to hold its competitive position in the world.

In addition to supplying dollars of aid, the United States has undertaken the principal burden of defense for the non-Communist world. * * * Americans are assuming this burden with no apparent complaint. This country's allies—now strong industrially—are not assuming equal burdens in the defense of the free world.

This survey did not point out what every one with a grain of sense knows; namely, that all of the defense of the free world which we are ruining ourselves to pay for does not provide any defense. We have neglected the vital defenses of our homeland to provide rich loot abroad for the Communists to take over.

On May 25, 1959, a Wall Street Journal editorial said:

An important shift has taken place in the U.S. economic position in the world. * * * foreign subsidiary operation by U.S. firms * * * is multiplying at an accelerating rate. U.S. brand-name goods are now manufactured all over the world. The United States is gradually pricing itself out of the world markets.

Here is what faces many an American business: It cannot make its product here and compete in world markets with the Germans, the British, or the Japanese. The alternative is a drastic reduction in its business or the export of some of its capital resources to another country, the erection of a plant there and the development of its worldwide business from a foreign, not a U.S. base. * * * All around us our economic position in the world disintegrates.

In a remarkable series of public statements in the latter part of April 1959, President Eisenhower said:

First, that inflation is a dreadful threat to the American economy.

Second, that he is making an all-out fight for a balanced budget because a sound dollar is the foundation of America's defense.

Third, and that all American businessmen should work tirelessly to obtain public and congressional acceptance of the President's recommended \$3.9 billion of new foreign-aid appropriations for this year.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY predicts that the Soviets will soon start pushing America out of world markets in agricultural goods. HUMPHREY's remedy is to enlarge the program which will make this possible. He wants bigger and more extravagant Federal farm programs, which build agricultural surpluses that are so high-priced they cannot be sold even on the domestic market, much less on the foreign market. HUMPHREY wants to increase our program of giving agricultural surpluses away abroad. Satisfy the world demand for agricultural goods by giving ours away, and we will elimi-

nate those markets that the Soviets are going to take away from us.

On May 22, 1959, at a time when every literate person on earth knew that America is in grave danger because inflation, caused primarily by policies of Government, is driving American capital and American gold reserves abroad, causing a relentless shift of industrial and economic strength from America to other nations, Mr. Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, made a speech in Dallas, to a gathering celebrating World Trade Week.

Mr. Kearns urged U.S. businessmen to invest their money abroad, and recommended legislation, pending in Congress, to give special tax treatment that will encourage American capital to flee overseas.

Will the end result be peace or chaos?

Your knowledge of the situation, fellow Members, is greater than mine since most of you have been here longer than I.

However, my guess is that we are breeding world discontent, fostering false and misleading hopes in our friendly allies and in the end the American people will end up disliked, distrusted, disillusioned, and at a tremendous disadvantage.

We will have to face up to a realistic revenue problem. Our basic tax is the income tax with the large part paid by individuals and limited corporate percentages. As we continue our foolish and dangerous course, we will have less and less personal and corporate income to tax. Will we then shift to consumer taxes completely?

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, we come with all our fallible judgments, that in Thy light the immediate might be set in the wide horizons of abiding virtues.

We would test our thoughts and words and deeds, not against the faulty background of our fellows, but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the crystal Christ.

In these dangerous and disturbing days sober us with a solemn sense of personal responsibility, and that Thy call to each one of us is to contribute to the world's good, our own life, strong, clean, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from any perversion of the power that has been entrusted to our hands.

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—

Such boasting as the Gentiles use Or lesser breeds without the Law— Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 20, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN WORLD SCIENCE PAN-PACIFIC EXPOSITION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-880, providing for participation of the United States in the World Science Pan-Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, I am transmitting herewith the report required under section 5(a) of that act.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 21, 1959.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7007. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7175. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 147. An act to suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, and combinations or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 3248. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, Hawaii;

H.R. 4282. An act to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4597. An act to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees' Training Act;